

Aristo of Ceos



Text, Translation, and Discussion

Rutgers University Studies in
Classical Humanities Volume XIII

William W. Fortenbaugh
& Stephen A. White, editors

Aristo of Ceos

Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities

Series Editor: William W. Fortenbaugh
Advisory Board: Dimitri Gutas
Pamela M. Huby
David C. Mirhady
Eckart Schütrumpf
Robert W. Sharples

On Stoic and Peripatetic Ethics: The Work of Arius Didymus,
volume I

Theophrastus of Eresus: On His Life and Work, volume II

*Theophrastean Studies: On Natural Science, Physics and Metaphysics,
Ethics, Religion and Rhetoric,* volume III

Cicero's Knowledge of the Peripatos, volume IV

*Theophrastus: His Psychological, Doxographical, and Scientific
Writings,* volume V

Peripatetic Rhetoric After Aristotle, volume VI

*The Passionate Intellect: Essays on the Transformation of Classical
Traditions presented to Professor I.G. Kidd,* volume VII

Theophrastus: Reappraising the Sources, volume VIII

Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation and Discussion, volume IX

Dicaearchus of Messana: Text, Translation and Discussion, volume X

Eudemus of Rhodes, volume XI

*Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes: Text, Translation and Discus-
sion,* volume XII

Aristo of Ceos: Text, Translation and Discussion, volume XIII

Aristo of Ceos

Text, Translation, and Discussion

Rutgers University Studies in
Classical Humanities, Volume XIII

William W. Fortenbaugh
& Stephen A. White, editors

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2006 by Transaction Publishers

Published 2017 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 2006 by Taylor & Francis.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notice:

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Catalog Number: 2006040397
ISSN: 0732-9814

Ariston, of Ceos.

[Works. English & Greek]

Aristo of Ceos : text, translation, and discussion / edited by William W. Fortenbaugh, Stephen A. White.

p. cm. — (Rutgers University studies in classical humanities)

Original Greek text and English translation; essays in English and Italian.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-7658-0283-X

1. Ariston, of Ceos—Criticism and interpretation. I. Fortenbaugh, William W. II. White, Stephen A. (Stephen Augustus) III. Title. IV. Series.

PA3874.A879

[A313 2006]

185—dc22

2006040397

ISBN 13: 978-0-7658-0283-5 (hbk)

Contents

Preface	vii
Contributors	ix
1. Aristo of Ceos: The Sources, Text and Translation <i>Peter Stork, Tiziano Dorandi, William W. Fortenbaugh, Johannes M. van Ophuijsen</i>	1–177
2. In Search of Aristo of Ceos <i>David Hahm</i>	179–215
3. I frammenti papiracei di Aristone di Ceo <i>Tiziano Dorandi</i>	217–238
4. L'Autore del Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας: Un problema riaperto <i>Graziano Ranocchia</i>	239–259
5. Characters in Aristo <i>Sabine Vogt</i>	261–278
6. Aristo on Blends of Arrogance <i>Voula Tsouna</i>	279–292
7. Aristo of Ceos in the Greek Gnomologies <i>Denis M. Searby</i>	293–305
8. Natural Philosophy in the Peripatos after Strato <i>Robert W. Sharples</i>	307–327
9. Peripatetic Biology and the <i>Epitome</i> of Aristophanes of Byzantium <i>Oliver Hellmann</i>	329–359
Index of Ancient Sources for Chapters 2–9	361–373



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Preface

This is the fifth volume in the RUSCH series to focus on Theophrastus' colleagues, pupils and successors. I.e., those Peripatetic philosophers, whom Fritz Wehrli brought together under the label "Die Schule des Aristoteles." Volume 9 was devoted to Demetrius of Phalerum, volume 10 to Dicaearchus of Messana, volume 11 to Eudemus of Rhodes, and volume 12 to Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes. The present volume, no. 13, concentrates on Aristo of Ceos, who was active in the last quarter of the third century BCE and almost certainly Lyco's successor as head of the Peripatetic School. Work on other members of the Peripatetic School is in progress and will be published in subsequent volumes of RUSCH.

Volume 13 contains a new edition of the fragments of Aristo. The Greek and Latin texts are accompanied by a critical apparatus of variant readings and by an English translation together with notes of various kinds. The essays that follow are concerned with the identity of Aristo, the papyrological tradition, Aristo's treatment of arrogance, and sayings attributed to Aristo in Greek gnomologies. The volume concludes with two essays on natural science. One considers the diminished interest in physics that began to characterize the Peripatos in the time of Lyco and Aristo. The other turns our attention to zoology and the work of Aristo's contemporary Aristophanes of Byzantium.

As in volume 12, so in this volume the collected essays are revised versions of papers presented at a conference on The Early Hellenistic Lyceum, held at the University of Texas at Austin on March 29–31, 2001. We want again to thank the College of Liberal Arts and the Department of Classics for hosting the conference, and especially Professor Cynthia Shelmerdine, the Chair of Classics at the time. As on so many previous occasions, we are indebted to Diane Smith, who prepared the camera-ready copy that was used in producing this volume.

WWF & SAW
August 2005



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Contributors

Tiziano DORANDI, CNRS, UPR 76, 7 rue G. Moquet, BP 8, F-94801 Villejuif cedex, France

William FORTENBAUGH, Department of Classics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick NJ 08901-1414, USA

David HAHM, Department of Greek and Latin, 414 University Hall, Ohio State University, Columbus OH 43210, USA

Oliver HELLMANN, FB II/Klassische Philologie, Universität Trier, D-54286 Trier, Germany

Graziano RANOCCHIA, Lessico Intellettuale Europeo e Storia delle Idee–Sezione Pensiero Antico, Università degli Studi “La Sapienza” di Roma, Via C. Fea 2, I-00161 Roma, Italy

Denis M. SEARBY, Department of Classical Philology, Uppsala University, S-75120 Uppsala, Sweden

Robert W. SHARPLES, Department of Greek and Latin, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK

Peter STORK, Department of Classics, Leiden University, Doelensteeg 16, PO Box 9515, NL-2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

Voula TSOUNA, Department of Philosophy, University of California, Santa Barbara CA 93106

Jan VAN OPHUIJSEN, Department of Philosophy, Utrecht University, Heidelberglaan 8, NL-3584 CS Utrecht, The Netherlands

x Contributors

Sabine VOGT, Lektorat Altertumswissenschaften, Verlag Walter de Gruyter, Genthiner Strasse 13, D-10785 Berlin, Germany

Stephen WHITE, Department of Classics, University of Texas, 1 University Station C3400, Austin TX 78712-0308, USA

1

Aristo of Ceos The Sources, Text and Translation

*Peter Stork, Tiziano Dorandi,
William W. Fortenbaugh, Johannes M. van Ophuijsen*

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS USED	9
TEXTS	
I. Life 1–6	26
II. Writings	
Titles of Books 7	34
List of Writings (of Aristo of Chios) 8	36
Judgment on Aristo's Style of Writing 9	38
Erotic Examples 10–14	40
Lyco 15	52
Lives of the Philosophers 16	52
Fragments of Uncertain Provenance 17A–D	54
III. Disputed	
On Old Age 18	62
On Flattery 19–20	64
On Arrogance 21a–o	66

Erotic Examples? 22	114
Lives of the Philosophers? 23–5	116
Fragments of Uncertain Provenance 26–9	124
IV. Sayings 30	130
V. Not Accepted	
Aristo the Peripatetic ≠ Aristo of Ceos 31	134
Aristo of Chios 32–5	134
Aristo the Younger 36–40	138
Sayings 41–4	140
Comparisons 45–7	142
Anecdotal Sayings of Aristotle 48–9	146
LIST OF CITATIONS OF ARISTO	150
CONCORDANCES	152
INDEX OF ARISTONEAN TEXTS	157
INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED	161
INDEX OF NAMES	170
INDEX OF MODERN SCHOLARS	175

INTRODUCTION

πολλοὶ μὲν οἱ Ἀρίστωνες

–Lucian, *Lexiphanes* 1

There were many Aristo's in antiquity and the often nonspecific manner of citing used in ancient texts (e.g., simply as "Aristo") inevitably causes problems.¹ As a result, the attribution of texts to Aristo of Ceos often is a matter of scholarly dispute, especially where Aristo of Ceos is to be distinguished from the Stoic Aristo of Chios, who is uncomfortably close to Aristo of Ceos not only in time of living, but also in the Greek and Latin designation of his home country (Κεῖος versus Χῖος and *Ceus* versus *Chius*). But these were not the only two. There was another Peripatetic, Aristo the "Younger," of the second century; and Aristo of Alexandria, also a Peripatetic later in life in the first century. These four Aristo's are listed in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* (1896), the *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques* (1989) and *Der Neue Pauly* (1996) under the following numbers:

		<i>RE</i>	<i>DPhA</i>	<i>DNP</i>
Aristo of Ceos	no.	52	396	3
Aristo of Chios	no.	56	397	7
Aristo the Younger	no.	53	392	5
Aristo of Alexandria	no.	54	393	2

The texts attributed to these four Aristo's have been collected in:

Aristo of Ceos: F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* 6, "Ariston von Keos," 27–67 (21968) and W. Knögel, *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem*, "Die Fragmente des Peripatetikers Ariston von Keos," 79–84 (1933);

Aristo of Chios: H. von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* 1.75–90 (1905), supplemented by A.M. Ioppolo, *Aristone di Chio e lo Stoicismo Antico*, "Testimonianze Mancanti degli SVF," 331–2 (1980);

Aristo the Younger: F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* 10, "Ariston der Jüngere," 77–88 (21969);

¹ See the "List of Citations of Aristo."

Aristo of Alexandria: I. Mariotti, *Aristone d'Alessandria* (1966).

The present edition of the fragments of Aristo of Ceos is modeled on that of the fragments of Demetrius of Phalerum in RUSCH vol. 9 and of Lyco of Troas in RUSCH vol. 12. In the case of Aristo of Ceos the format of the edition is determined—much more so than in the case of Demetrius of Phalerum or Lyco of Troas—by the often problematic nature of the attribution of the fragments, particularly where the distinction between Aristo of Ceos versus Aristo of Chios is involved.

The texts are divided into five sections: I texts concerning the *Life* of Aristo of Ceos (1–6); II and III texts concerning the *Writings* of Aristo of Ceos, that is to say, II texts concerning the *Writings* of which the attribution to Aristo of Ceos is considered certain and uncontested (7–17); III texts concerning the *Writings* of which the attribution to Aristo of Ceos is considered uncertain and *Disputed* (18–29); IV texts preserving *Sayings* that (rightly or wrongly) have been attributed to Aristo of Ceos (30); V texts that have been attributed to Aristo of Ceos but are *Not accepted* in the present edition and are listed mainly for ease of reference (31–49). Most of the texts are what traditionally are called *testimonia* rather than *fragmenta*.

The decision to include a fragment either in section II (fragments of *certain* attribution) or in section III (fragments of *disputed* attribution) was made on the strictly formal ground of the presence or absence of a sufficiently explicit reference to Aristo of Ceos in the texts and not on the philosophical contents. In III the uncertainty of attribution is caused almost exclusively by the nonspecific nature of the reference (“Aristo” in 19–29); in one case (18) by a difference in reading of the MSS. The scholarly debate concerning the attribution of these texts invariably involves the choice between the Peripatetic Aristo of Ceos and the Stoic Aristo of Chios, and is of necessity wholly based upon the contents of the texts. The editors purposely abstain from arguing either way, and merely aim at presenting the material with a maximum of clarity in order that the users may judge for themselves.

The material is not large enough to admit of any extensive subdivision of the five sections. In the case of the texts concerning the *Writings* (II & III), the texts have been arranged according to the title (*Lyco* 15) or subject matter (On Old Age, On Flattery, On Arrogance 18–21) mentioned in the texts and in such a way as to facilitate the comparison of the texts of certain attribution with those of *disputed* attribution (e.g., under the

parallel headings “Erotic Examples” **10–14** and **22**, “Lives of the Philosophers” **16** and **23–5**, “Of uncertain provenance” **17** and **26–9**).

Texts that have *not* been *accepted* (V) are arranged primarily according to the identity of the Aristo who appears most likely to be involved (Aristo of Chios **32–5**; **41–4**; **45–7**; Aristo the Younger **36–40**; Aristo the Peripatetic $\neq$ Aristo of Ceos **31**). These texts are *printed* whenever Wehrli and/or Knögel print the text as a fragment of Aristo of Ceos (**31–3**; **41–9**); in all other cases only a *reference* to the text is given (**34–40**).²

The present edition has 22 texts more than Wehrli’s edition (**4B**; **13B**; **19**; **29**; **30**; **32–44**; **46–9**); one text included by Wehrli is excluded from the present edition (**31**). Of the added texts, two are parallel texts not included by Wehrli (**4B**; **13B**); one (a papyrus text) was not known at the time of Wehrli’s edition (**19**); the remainder are texts of *disputed* attribution (**29**) or texts that have *not* been *accepted* (**32–44**; **46–9**).

The texts are numbered from **1** to **49**. In some cases (**2A–B**; **4A–B**; **13A–B**; **14A–B**; **17A–D**; **24A–B**), a number covers two or more texts which are distinguished by the letters A-B(-C-D). These texts refer to the same specific subject matter (in that sense they are *parallel texts*), but the information supplied by these texts differs significantly enough to quote them in full. In the case of *PHerc.* 1008 the columns of the papyrus have been numbered separately **21a–o**.

In editing the texts, the editors have taken as their starting-point the text of an existing recent edition (mentioned in the heading of the text with line numbers of the edition used). That does not mean that the text printed here is identical to that of the edition mentioned in the heading. The editors have felt free to make changes in the text. These changes are accounted for in the lower critical apparatus, and reflect our editorial policy. In an edition of fragments, problems relating to the constitution of the text ought to be made perfectly clear to the user and not glossed over in order to effect an “easy” reading.

The *texts* as printed in this edition are based upon the information supplied in the editions used, and no original research on the *paradosis* has been done by the editors, with the following exceptions. The texts from Diogenes Laertius (**1**, **5**; **8**; **16**; **23–5**) are based upon collations

² Included by Knögel but not by Wehrli are **32–3**; as “uncertain” **41–4**, **46–7** and **48–9**; not included by Knögel, but included by Wehrli, are **21c–o**, **22**, **28** and **31**.

made by Tiziano Dorandi in preparing a new edition of the *Vitae Philosophorum*. Anna Angeli of the Liceo Classico Vittorio Emanuele III di Napoli has generously put at our disposal information based upon personal inspection of *PHerc.* 1457 (**20**) and 1008 (**21a**) which has not yet been published; the text of these fragments printed in the present collection is based upon her inspection of the papyri. Stefan Radt of Groningen University has generously put at our disposal the text, *apparatus criticus* and commentary of his new Strabo edition (Göttingen 2003–) for the two Strabo texts (**2A** and **31**).³

References to the corresponding *testimonia* and *fragmenta* in Wehrli's edition are given in the left-hand margin of the Greek text at the line where Wehrli's fragment begins. The *upper apparatus* of parallel texts makes reference to all parallel texts in the strict sense which explicitly mention Aristo of Ceos (the line numbers of the edition used are always added in these cases), and also to parallel texts in a wider sense which, without referring to Aristo, contain information that seems particularly relevant to the interpretation of the text (the passage or text is merely cited in these cases and often introduced by means of *cf.*). In addition, references are given to modern editions or collections of fragments of authors mentioned in the text. Finally, there are cross-references by means of numbers in bold type to other texts in the present collection in order to assist the user in collecting information.

The *lower* or *critical* apparatus is based upon the critical apparatus of the edition used for the text. It is selective and aims at supplying information specially relevant to the user of this edition. As a rule it is fuller than that found in the edition of Wehrli.

The *translation* tries to effect the impossible in being both readable and as close to the original as possible. The Philodemus texts (**19–21**) have proven to be particularly difficult in this respect and the editors—who with one exception are not native speakers of (American) English—are fully aware that their word-by-word translation is likely to compare unfavorably with a continuous translation like that of Voula Tsouna or Jeffrey Rusten.

The *notes to the translation* serve two purposes. First, they may supply (often quite basic) information which will assist the user in understanding and interpreting the text. Second, they place the text within the wider context of the work from which it has been taken. Although the

³ **2A** is now published in volume 3 of his Strabo edition.

notes are not intended as a full commentary, they are fuller than they would be if the editors were planning to add a companion volume containing a commentary. This is especially so in the case of the fragments of disputed attribution (III) and the fragments that have not been accepted (V), where the (often tedious lists of) references aim solely at assisting the users in finding their way in the maze of secondary literature on the subject.

Tables of *Abbreviations* and of *Editions Used* have been provided. All abbreviations not found in these tables are those of LSJ. In view of the many references in the notes to the translation, a separate list of *Studies cited in this edition* has been added; it is not intended to be exhaustive. The *Concordances* relate the texts in this edition to those of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli (1968) and Knögel (1933);⁴ to those of Aristo of Chios by Arnim (*SVF* 1905), Festa (1935) and Ioppolo (1980); to that of Aristo the Younger by Wehrli (1969); and to that of Aristo of Alexandria by Mariotti (1966). The *Index of Aristonean Texts* lists all Aristonean texts in the strict sense of the word, i.e., all texts explicitly mentioning Aristo of Ceos, printed here as a text (indicated by means of numbers in bold type) or entered in a list, and all parallel texts in the strict sense, i.e. all parallel texts explicitly mentioning Aristo of Ceos, entered in the upper apparatus. All other passages cited in the upper (or lower) apparatus and in the notes to the translation are listed in the *Index of Passages Cited*. The *Index of Names* to the translation may help the users in finding their way through the fragments more quickly. Because the notes to the translation cite many modern scholars, an *Index of Modern Scholars* has been added in order to make it easier to collect the opinions of the various scholars who have worked on Aristo of Ceos. Finally, a *List of Citations of Aristo* is added in order to provide an overview of the manner in which Aristo is cited in the fragments.

A first version of this edition was prepared by the team of editors, consisting of Peter Stork, William W. Fortenbaugh, Tiziano Dorandi, and Johannes M. van Ophuijsen, for the Eleventh Conference of Project

⁴ J.G. Hubmann, "Ariston von Keos, der Peripatetiker. Eine historisch-kritische Zusammenstellung aus Bruchstücken des Alterthums," *Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* Supplementband 3.1 (1834) 102–26 is hardly to be called an edition of the fragments and is, therefore, not included in the Concordances.

Theophrastus, which was hosted by Stephen A. White, at the University of Texas at Austin, March 29–31 2001.

The editors have benefitted from the assistance of a number of colleagues. Voula Tsouna of the University of California at Santa Barbara γυνὴ χαριστάτη ἐγόρευτο by putting at our disposal her translation of the Philodemus text of *PHerc.* 1008 at a time when she was engaged in finalizing her own translation and preparing it for the press. Stephen A. White of the University of Texas at Austin has extended his activities as editor of the volume περιττότερόν τι by scrutinizing with great acumen and evident love for (philological) ἀκρίβεια the pre-final version of this edition. Adriaan Rademaker of Leiden University has helped in clarifying what at first seemed to be a mere jumble of words in column 10 of *PHerc.* 1008.

Work on this edition has been facilitated by the use of the CD ROM disk #E of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* and the CD ROM disk #5.3 (Latin Texts) of the Packard Institute. In the initial stage, work on the edition by Peter Stork was made possible through a grant of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).

In recognition of their close collaboration, the editors would very much appreciate the present edition being referred to by means of the abbreviation “SFOD.”⁵

⁵ “SFOD” is also the preferred abbreviation when referring to a fragment of Lyco printed in *Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes* = RUSCH 12, p. 16–67.

ABBREVIATIONS AND EDITIONS USED

The list under (a) explains the abbreviations used in this collection to refer to standard collections and scholarly journals; that under (b) lists the text editions used for this collection; that under (c) lists the studies cited in this edition; that under (d) explains other abbreviations used; and that under (e) explains the symbols used in the apparatus of this collection.

(a) Names, Standard Collections, Scholarly Journals, etc.

<i>AJPh</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
<i>ASPhL</i>	<i>Acta Societatis Philologiae Lipsiensis</i>
<i>BFC</i>	<i>Bollettino di Filologia Classica</i>
<i>BT</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana.</i> Leipzig
<i>CA</i>	<i>Collectanea Alexandrina</i> ed. J.U. Powell. Oxford 1925
<i>CB</i>	<i>Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage</i> <i>de l'Association Guillaume Budé.</i> Paris
<i>CErc</i>	<i>Cronache Ercolanesi</i>
<i>CPh</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>DK</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> edd. H. Diels, W. Kranz. 3 vols. Berlin ⁶ 1951–2
<i>DNP</i>	<i>Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike.</i> Stuttgart & Weimar 1996–2003
<i>DPhA</i>	<i>Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques.</i> Paris 1989–
<i>FGE</i>	D.L. Page, <i>Further Greek Epigrams.</i> Cambridge 1982
<i>FGrH</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker</i> ed. F. Jacoby. Leiden 1926–58
<i>FHG</i>	<i>Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i> ed. C. Müller. Paris 1841– 70
<i>FHS&G</i>	<i>Theophrastus of Eresus. Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought</i> <i>and Influence</i> edd. W.W. Fortenbaugh, P.M. Huby, R.W. Sharples, D. Gutas. 2 vols. Leiden 1992
<i>FSA</i>	<i>I Frammenti degli Stoici Antichi</i> ed. N. Festa. 2 vols. Bari 1935
<i>GCS</i>	<i>Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahr-</i> <i>hunderte.</i> Berlin
<i>IEG</i>	<i>Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati</i> ed. M.L. West. 2 vols. Oxford 1971–2
<i>IGM</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae Metricae</i> ed. T. Preger. Leipzig 1891
<i>JPh</i>	<i>The Journal of Philology</i>
<i>LG</i>	<i>Lexicographi Graeci.</i> Leipzig
<i>MH</i>	<i>Museum Helveticum</i>

10 Aristo of Ceos

OCT	<i>Oxford Classical Texts</i>
PCG	<i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> edd. R. Kassel et C. Austin. Berlin & New York 1983–
PE	<i>Papiri Ercolanesi</i>
PG	<i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca</i> ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris 1857–66
PGR	<i>Paradoxographorum Graecorum Reliquiae</i> ed. A. Giannini. Milan 1966
PHerc.	<i>Papyrus Herculanensis</i>
PhW	<i>Philologische Wochenschrift</i>
PMG	<i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> ed. D.L. Page. Oxford 1962
PP	<i>La Parola del Passato. Rivista di Studi Antichi</i>
RE	<i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> . Stuttgart
RFIC	<i>Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica</i>
RhM	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i>
RUSCH	<i>Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities</i>
SA	<i>Scholia in Aristophanem</i> edd. W.J.W. Koster & D. Holwerda. Groningen 1960–
SB Wien	<i>Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien</i>
SFIC	<i>Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica</i>
SGRA	B. Laum, <i>Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike, II Urkunden</i> . Leipzig & Berlin 1914
SSR	<i>Socratis et Socraticorum Reliquiae</i> ed. G. Giannantoni. Vols. 1, 2. Naples 1990
SVF	<i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i> ed. H. von Arnim. 3 vols. Leipzig 1905. 1903. 1903
TrGF	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> . 5 vols. Göttingen ² 1986. 1981. 1985. 1977 (² 1999). 2004
W = Wehrli	see Aristo Ceus
WS	<i>Wiener Studien</i>
ZAnt	<i>Ziva Antika</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

(b) Editions Used

Ael. VH	<i>Claudii Aeliani Varia Historia</i> ed. M.R. Dils. Leipzig 1974 [BT]
NA	<i>Claudii Aeliani De Natura Animalium</i> ed. R. Hercher, Vol. 1. Leipzig 1864 [BT]
Alexinus	K. Döring, <i>Die Megariker. Kommentierte Sammlung der Testimonien</i> . Amsterdam 1972, 21–7
Antigon.	<i>Antigone de Caryste. Fragments</i> ed. T. Dorandi. Paris 1999 [CB]
Wilamowitz	U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, <i>Antigonos von Karystos</i> . Berlin 1881
Antip. Stoic.	Antipater Tarsensis: SVF 3.244–58

- Anton. *Antonii Monachi cognomento Melissae Loci Communes* ed. J.-P. Migne. Paris 1865 [PG 136]
- Apollod. Apollodorus Atheniensis 244 *FGrH* II B 1022–1128
- Jacoby F. Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik. Eine Sammlung der Fragmente*. Berlin 1902
- Apophth. Vind.* C. Wachsmuth, “Die Wiener Apophthegmen-Sammlung,” *Festschrift zur Begrüssung der XXXVI. Philologen-Versammlung*. Freiburg i.B. & Tübingen 1882, 1–36
- Apostol. Apostolius Paroemiographus, in: *Paroemiographi Graeci* ed. E.L. von Leutsch, Vol. 2. Göttingen 1851, 233–744
- App. Vat. I* *Appendix Vaticana* I ed. L. Sternbach, in: *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejtnosci. Wydział Filologiczny* 2.5. Kraków 1894, 171–202
- Arched. Stoic. Archedemus Tarsensis: *SVF* 3.262–4
- Aristo Alex. *Aristone d’Alessandria* ed. I. Mariotti. Bologna 1966
- Aristo Ceus F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Vol. 6 *Lykon und Ariston von Keos*. Basel & Stuttgart ²1968
- Knögel W. Knögel, *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem*. Leipzig 1933 [Anhang: “Die Fragmente des Peripatetikers Ariston von Keos,” 79–94]
- Aristo Chius Aristo Chius: *SVF* 1.75–90; *Festa FSA* 2.1–34
- Aristo Junior F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Vol. 10 *Hieronymos von Rhodos. Kritolaos und seine Schüler*. Basel & Stuttgart ²1969, *Ariston der Jüngere* 77–88
- Ar. Byz. *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta* ed. W.J. Slater. Berlin & New York 1986
- Arist. *Fragm.* *Aristotelis Qui Ferebantur Librorum Fragmenta* ed. V. Rose. Leipzig 1886 [BT]
- Apophth.* D.M. Searby, *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition*. Uppsala 1998
- Düring I. Düring, *Aristotle in the Ancient Biographical Tradition*. Göteborg 1957
- Gigon *Aristotelis Opera*. Vol. 3 *Librorum Deperditorum Fragmenta* ed. O. Gigon. Berlin & New York 1987
- Pseud.* V. Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus*. Leipzig 1863
- Ars. ΑΡΣΕΝΙΟΥ ΙΩΝΙΑ. *Arsenii Violetum* ed. Chr. Walz. Stuttgart 1832
- Ath. *Athenaei Naucratis Dipnosophistarum Libri XV* ed. G. Kaibel. 3 vols. Leipzig 1887–90 [BT]
- Epit.* *Athenaei Dipnosophistarum Epitome* ed. S.P. Peppink. Vol. 2.2. Leiden 1939
- Bion J.F. Kindstrand, *Bion of Borysthenes. A Collection of the Fragments with Introduction and Commentary*. Uppsala 1976
- Charis. *Ars Gram.* *Flavii Sosipatri Charisii Artis Grammaticae Libri V* ed. C. Barwick. Leipzig 1925 [BT]
- Chrysipp. Stoic. Chrysippus Soleus: *SVF* 2.1–348 & 3.3–204
- Chrys. *ecl. 1–48* Joannes Chrysostomus, *Eclogae ex Diversis Homiliis* [PG 63]

12 Aristo of Ceos

- Cic. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia*
Fin. — Vol. 13, fasc. 43 *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum Libri Quinque* ed. Th. Schiche. Leipzig 1915 [BT]
Tusc. — Vol. 13, fasc. 44 *Tusculanae Disputationes* ed. M. Pohlenz. Leipzig 1918 [BT]
Sen. Cicero. *Cato Maior De Senectute* ed. J.G.F. Powell. Cambridge 1988
Wuilleumier *Cicéron. Caton l'Ancien (De la Vieillesse)* ed. P. Wuilleumier. Paris ²1960 [CB]
- Cleanth. Stoic. Cleanthes Assius: *SVF* 1.103–37
Clearch. F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Vol. 3 *Klearchos*. Basel & Stuttgart ²1969
- Clem. Al. *Strom.* *Clemens Alexandrinus*. Vol. 2 *Stromata Buch I–VI* edd. O. Stählin, L. Früchtel. Berlin ³1960 [GCS]
- Crantor H.J. Mette, “Zwei Akademiker heute: Krantor von Soloi und Arkesilaos von Pitane,” *Lustrum* 26 (1984) 7–94
- Critolaus see Aristo Junior
Curt. *Q. Curti Rufi Historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedonis Libri Qui Supersunt* ed. E. Hedicke. Leipzig 1908
- Demad. *Demade Oratore. Testimonianze e Frammenti* ed. V. de Falco. Naples ²1955 (1932)
- Demetr. Magn. J. Mejer, “Demetrius of Magnesia: On Poets and Authors of the Same Name,” *Hermes* 109 (1981) 447–72
- Dem. Phal. SOD *Demetrius of Phalerum: The Sources, Text and Translation* edd. P. Stork, J.M. van Ophuijsen, T. Dorandi, *RUSCH* 9 (2000) 1–310
- Diodorus Tyrius see Aristo Junior, 85–91
Diog. Bab. Stoic. Diogenes Babylonius: *SVF* 3.210–43
D.L. *Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum*, Vol. 1 *Libri I–X*, Vol. 2 *Excerpta Byzantina et Indices* ed. M. Marcovich, Vol. 3 *Indices* ed. H. Gärtner. Stuttgart & Leipzig 1999–2002 [BT]
- Brunschwig J. Brunschwig, “Livre IX. Introduction, Traduction et Notes,” in: *Diogène Laërce. Vies et Doctrines des Philosophes Illustres*. Traduction française sous la direction de M.-O. Goulet-Cazé. Paris 1999, 1025–1145
- Casaubon *Isaaci Casauboni Notae Ad Diogenis Laertii Libros De Vitis, Dictis et Decretis Principum Philosophorum. Editio altera, auctior et emendatior*, in: *Diog. Laert. De Vitis, Dogm. et Apophth. Clarorum Philosophorum, Libri X* ed. H. Stephanus. Genève 1594 (in: Hübner, *Comm.*)
- Cobet *Diogenis Laertii De Clarorum Philosophorum Vitis, Dogmatibus et Apophthegmatibus Libri Decem* ed. C.G. Cobet. Paris 1850
- Hübner, *Comm.* *Commentarii in Diogenem Laertium* ed. H.G. Hübner. 2 vols. (1: *Isaaci Casauboni Notae in Diogenem Laertium*, 7–138; *Aegidii Menagii Observationes et Emendationes in Diogenem Laertium*, 1, 139–670 & 2, 1–592). Leipzig 1830. 1833

- Madvig J.N. Madvig, *Adversaria Critica ad Scriptores Graecos et Latinos*, Vol. 1. Copenhagen 1871
- Menagius Aegidius Menagius, *Observationes et Emendationes in Diogenem Laertium*. Paris 1663 (in: Hübner, *Comm.*)
- Stephanus see Casaubon
- Divis. Aristot.* *Divisiones Quae Vulgo Dicuntur Aristoteleae* ed. H. Mutschmann. Leipzig 1906 [BT].
- Doxopater ΤΟΥ ΔΟΞΑΠΑΤΡΟΥ ΠΗΤΟΡΙΚΑΙ ΟΜΙΛΙΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΑΦΘΟΝΙΟΥ ΠΡΟΓΥΜΝΑΣΜΑΤΑ, in: *Rhetores Graeci* ed. C. Walz, Vol. 2. Stuttgart 1835, 81–564
- Emp. *Empedocle. Poema Fisico e Lustrale* ed. C. Gallavotti. Milan 1975
- Epicur. *Epicurea* ed. H. Usener. Leipzig 1887
- Arrighetti *Epicuro Opere* ed. G. Arrighetti. Turin ²1973 (1960)
- Erasistratus *Erasistrati Fragmenta* ed. I. Garofalo. Pisa 1988
- EG *Etymologicum Gudianum* ed. F.W. Sturz. Leipzig 1818
- EM *Etymologicum Magnum* ed. Th. Gaisford. Oxford 1848
- Eudox. *Die Fragmente des Eudoxos von Knidos* ed. F. Lasserre. Berlin 1966
- Eur. *Fragm.* *TrGF* vol. 5.1–2 ed. R. Kannicht. Göttingen 2004
- Mette H.J. Mette, “Euripides (insbesondere für die Jahre 1968–1981). Erster Hauptteil: Die Bruchstücke,” *Lustrum* 23–24 (1981–1982) 3–448
- Jouan & v. Looy *Euripide. Tome 8.2 Fragments. Bellérophon–Protésilas* edd. F. Jouan & H. van Looy. Paris 2000 [CB]
- Vita in: *Scholia in Euripidem* ed. E. Schwartz. Vol. 1. Berlin 1887, 1–8
- Thom. Mag. Θωμᾶ τοῦ Μαγίστρου σύνοψις τοῦ βίου τοῦ Εὐριπίδου, in: *BIOΓΡΑΦΟΙ. Vitarum Scriptores Graeci Minores* ed. A. Westermann. Braunschweig 1845, 139–40
- Eus. PE *Eusebius Werke*. Vol. 8 *Die Praeparatio Evangelica* ed. K. Mras. Vol. 2. Berlin 1956 [GCS]
- Eust. II. *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* ed. M. Van der Valk. 4 vols. Leiden 1971–87
- Frontin. *Strat.* *Iuli Frontini Strategemata* ed. R.I. Ireland. Leipzig 1990 [BT]
- Gnom. Neap.* *Gnomologium Neapolitanum* ed. F. Sbordone, “Sentenze di filosofi e detti celebri di antichi Spartani,” in: *Scritti di Varia Filologia*. Naples 1971, 163–94 (= *Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica* 19.3–4 [1935] 1–18)
- Gnom. Par.* *Gnomologium Parisinum Ineditum* ed. L. Sternbach, *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejetnosci. Wydział Filologiczny* Ser. 2.5. Kraków 1894, 135–70
- Gnom. Vat.* *Gnomologium Vaticanum e Codice Vaticano Graeco 743* ed. L. Sternbach. Berlin 1963 (= *WS* 9 (1887) 175–206; 10 (1888) 1–49, 211–60; 11 (1889) 43–64, 192–242)
- Harp. *Harpocraton, Lexeis of the Ten Orators* ed. J.J. Keaney. Amsterdam 1991

14 Aristo of Ceos

- Hegesand. Hegesander Delphicus: *FHG* 4.412–22
- Heracl. Pont. F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Vol. 7 *Herakleides Pontikos*. Basel & Stuttgart ²1969
- Heraclit. Heraclitus: 22 DK 1.139–90
- Kirk *Heraclitus. The Cosmic Fragments* ed. G.S. Kirk. Cambridge 1954
- Marcovich *Eraclito. Frammenti* ed. M. Marcovich. Florence 1978
- Mondolfo *Eraclito. Testimonianze e Imitazioni* edd. R. Mondolfo & L. Tarán. Florence 1972
- Hermarchus K. Krohn, *Der Epikureer Hermarchos*. Diss. Berlin 1921
- Longo *Ermarco. Frammenti* ed. F. Longo Auricchio. Naples 1988
- Hermipp. *Hermippos of Smyrna* ed. J. Bollansée. Leiden 1999 (*FGrH* IV A 3)
- Ps.-Hsch. Mil. *Pseudo-Hesychii Milesii De Viris Illustribus* ed. M. Marcovich: *Diogenis Laertii Vitae Philosophorum*, Vol. 2 (Leipzig 1999), 89–138 [BT]
- Hieronym. *Hieronymus of Rhodes: The Sources. Text and Translation* ed. S.A. White, in: *RUSCH* 12 (2004) 79–276
- Wehrli see Aristo Junior
- Hippobotus M. Gigante, “Hippoboti Fragmenta,” in: A. Mastrocinque (ed.), *Omaggio a Piero Treves*. Padua 1983, 179–93
- Isid. *Etym.* *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum Libri XX*, vol. 2 ed. W.M. Lindsay. Oxford 1911 [OCT]
- Isig. Isigonus Paradoxographus, in *PGR* 146–8
- Leucipp. Leucippus: 67 DK 2.70–81
- Luc. *Laps.* Lucianus *Pro Lapsu inter Salutandum: Luciani Opera*. Vol. 3 ed. D.M. Macleod. Oxford 1980 [OCT]
- Lucil. *Lucilius. Satiren* ed. W. Krenkel. 2 vols. Leiden 1970
- Lycō SFOD *Lycō of Troas. The Sources. Text and Translation* edd. P. Stork, W.W. Fortenbaugh, T. Dorandi, J.M. van Ophuijsen, in: *RUSCH* 12 (2004) 1–78
- Wehrli see Aristo Ceus
- Lycophronid. Lycophronides Lyricus: *PMG* p. 446
- Ps.-Max. S. Ihm, *Ps.-Maximus Confessor. Erste kritische Edition einer Redaktion des sacro-profanen Florilegiums Loci Communes*. Stuttgart 2001
- Muson. *C. Musonii Rufi Reliquiae* ed. O. Hense. Leipzig 1905 [BT]
- Nausiph. Nausiphanes Teios: 75 DK 2.246–50
- Non. *Nonii Marcelli De Conpendiosa Doctrina Libros XX* ed. W.M. Lindsay. Vol. 2. Leipzig 1903 [BT]
- Orib. *Coll. med.* Oribasius, *Collectiones Medicae* ed. J. Raeder. Leipzig 1928–33
- Pamphil. Pamphilus, in: F. Lasserre, *De Léodamas de Thasos à Philippe d’Oponte. Témoignages et Fragments*. Naples 1987
- Panaetius van Str. *Panaetii Rhodii Fragmenta* ed. M. van Straaten. Leiden ³1962 (1952)
- Alesse *Panezio di Rodi. Testimonianze* ed. F. Alesse. Naples 1997

- Par. Flor. Paradoxographus Florentinus, in: *PGR* 315–29
Ideler *Physici et Medici Graeci Minores* ed. J.L. Ideler. Vol. 1. Berlin 1841
Öhler *Paradoxographi Florentini Anonymi Opusculum De Aquis Mirabilibus* ed. H. Öhler. Diss. Tübingen 1913
Par. Pal. Paradoxographus Palatinus, in: *PGR* 353–61
Par. Vat. Paradoxographus Vaticanus, in: *PGR* 331–51
Keller O. Keller, *Rerum Naturalium Scriptores Graeci Minores*. Vol. 1. Leipzig 1877 [BT]
Rohde *Isigoni Nicaeensis De Rebus Mirabilibus Breviarium ex Codice Vaticano* ed. E. Rohde, in: *ASPhL* 1 (1872) 25–42
Philet. *Philetas Coi Reliquiae* ed. W. Kuchenmüller. Diss. Berlin 1928
Dettori *Filita Grammatico. Testimonianze e Frammenti* ed. E. Dettori. Rome 2000
Sbardella *Filita. Testimonianze e Frammenti poetici* ed. L. Sbardella. Rome 2000
Spanoudakis *Philetas of Cos* ed. K. Spanoudakis. Leiden 2002
Philoch. Philochorus Atheniensis: 328 *FGrH* III B.97–160
Phld. Acad. Hist. Philodemus, *Academicorum Historia*, in: *Filodemo. Storia dei Filosofi. Platone e l'Academia* ed. T. Dorandi. Naples 1991
Adul. Bassi ΦΙΛΟΔΗΜΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΚΑΚΙΩΝ (Pap. 1457), ΦΙΛΟΔΗΜΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΘΑΝΑΤΟΥ Δ (Pap. 1050) ed. D. Bassi. Milan 1914 (= *Papiri Ercolanesi*, Vol. I), 1–18
Gargiulo T. Gargiulo, “PHerc. 222: Filodemo sull’Adulazione,” *CErc* 11 (1981) 103–27
Kondo E. Kondo, “Per l’interpretazione del pensiero filodemeo sulla adulazione nel PHerc 1457,” *CErc* 4 (1974) 43–56
Div. A. Tepedino Guerra, “Il primo libro ‘Sulla ricchezza’ di Filodemo,” *CErc* 8 (1978) 52–95
Mort. T. Kuiper, *Philodemus over den Dood*. Amsterdam 1925
Oec. *Philodemi Περὶ Οἰκονομίας Qui Dicitur Libellus (PHerc. 1424)* ed. C. Jensen. Leipzig 1906
Po. C. Jensen, *Philodemos über die Gedichte. Fünftes Buch*. Berlin 1923
Mangoni *Filodemo. Il Quinto Libro della Poetica (PHerc. 1425 e 1538)* ed. C. Mangoni. Naples 1993
Rh. *Philodemi Volumina Rhetorica* ed. S. Sudhaus. 2 vols. Leipzig 1892. 1896
Longo ΦΙΛΟΔΗΜΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΠΗΤΟΙΚΗΣ *Libros Primum et Secundum* ed. F. Longo Auricchio. Naples 1977
Vit. *Philodemi ΠΕΡΙ ΚΑΚΙΩΝ Liber Decimus (PHerc. 1008)* ed. C. Jensen. Leipzig 1911 [BT]
Cobet 1847 C.G. Cobet, *Oratio de Arte Interpretandi Grammatices et Critices Fundamentis Innixa Primario Philologi Officio*. Leiden 1847
Cobet 1874 C.G. Cobet, “Ad Philodemi Librum X Περὶ Κακίων et Theophrasti Χαρακτῆρας Ἠθικῆς,” *Mnemosyne* 2 (1874) 28–33

16 Aristo of Ceos

- Delattre D. Delattre ap. Tsouna 2004
- Hartung J.A. Hartung, *Philodem's Abhandlungen über die Haushaltung und über den Hochmut und Theophrast's Haushaltung und Charakterbilder*. Leipzig 1857
- Knögel see Aristo Ceus
- Rusten "Fragments of the Character Sketches of Ariston of Keos (III–II B.C.)," in: *Theophrastus Characters. Herodas Mimes. Cercidas and the Choliambic Poets*, edd. J. Rusten, I.C. Cunningham & A.D. Knox, Cambridge Mass. & London 1993 [Loeb], 182–95
- Sauppe *Philodemi de Vitiis Liber Decimus. Ad Voluminis Herculanensis Exempla Neapolitanum et Oxoniense distinxit supplevit explicavit* H. Sauppe. *Jahresbericht über das Wilhelm-Ernstische Gymnasium zu Weimar von 1849–1853*. Weimar 1853
- Sedley D.N. Sedley ap. Tsouna 2004
- Spengel L. Spengel in *Gelehrte Anzeigen der K. Bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, München, no. 255 (1838) 1001–6; no. 256 (1838) 1009–16; no. 257 (1838) 1017–22
- Ussing J.L. Ussing, *Theophrasti Characterismi Duo ex Rutilio Lupo et ex Rhetoricis ad Herennium*. Copenhagen 1868
- Philostr. VA *Vita Apollonii: Flavii Philostrati Opera* ed. C.L. Kayser. Vol. 1. Leipzig 1870 [BT]
- Phot. Bibl. *Photius. Bibliothèque* ed. R. Henry. Vol. 2. Paris 1960 [CB]
- Lex. *Photii Lexicon* ed. R. Porson. 2 vols. Leipzig 1823
- Phylarch. Phylarchus Atheniensis: 81 *FGrH* II A 161–89
- Plato *Platonica* A.W. Riginos, *Platonica. The Anecdotes Concerning the Life and Writings of Plato*. Leiden 1976
- Plinius *N.H.* *Pline l'Ancien. Histoire Naturelle Livre XXXI* ed. G. Serbat. Paris 1972 [CB]
- Plu. Arist. *Aristides: Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae* Vol. 1.1 ed. K. Ziegler. Leipzig ³1960 [BT]
- Cat. Ma. *Cato Maior: Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae* Vol. 1.1
- Dem. *Demosthenes: Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae* Vol. 1.2 ed. K. Ziegler. Leipzig ²1959 [BT]
- Lys. *Lysander: Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae* Vol. 3.2 ed. K. Ziegler. Leipzig ²1973 [BT]
- Phoc. *Phocion: Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae* Vol. 2.1 ed. K. Ziegler. Leipzig ²1964 [BT]
- Them. *Themistocles: Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae* Vol. 1.1
- Adv. Col. *Adversus Colotem: Plutarchi Moralia* Vol. 6.2 ed. M. Pohlenz. Leipzig 1952 [BT]
- Amat. *Amatorius: Plutarchi Moralia* Vol. 4 ed. C. Hubert. Leipzig 1971 [BT]
- Bernardakis *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* ed. G.N. Bernardakis, Vol. 4. Leipzig 1892 [BT]
- Helmbold W.C. Helmbold, *Plutarch's Moralia*. Vol. 9. London & Cambridge, Mass. 1969 [Loeb]

<i>An seni</i>	<i>An Seni sit Gerenda Res Publica: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 5.1 ed. C. Hubert. Leipzig 1957 [BT]
<i>De aud.</i>	<i>Quomodo Adolescens Poetas Audire Debeat = De Audiendis Poetis: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 1 edd. W.R. Paton, I. Wegehaupt, M. Pohlenz, H. Gärtner. Leipzig ² 1974 [BT]
<i>De cur.</i>	<i>De Curiositate: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 3 edd. W.R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, W. Sieveking. Leipzig 1929 [BT]
<i>De exil.</i>	<i>De Exilio: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 3
<i>De Fortuna</i>	<i>De Fortuna: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 1
<i>De inv. et od.</i>	<i>De Invidia et Odio: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 3
<i>De tuenda san.</i>	<i>De Tuenda Sanitate Praecepta: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 1
<i>Praec. ger. rep.</i>	<i>Praecepta Gerendae Reipublicae: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 5.1
<i>Quaest. conv.</i>	<i>Quaestiones Convivales: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 4
<i>Reg. et imp. apophth.</i>	<i>Regum et Imperatorum Apophthegmata: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 2 edd. W. Nachstädt, W. Sieveking, J.B. Titchener. Leipzig 1935 [BT]
<i>Fragm.</i>	<i>Fragmenta: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 7 ed. F.H. Sandbach. Leipzig 1967 [BT]
[Plu.] <i>Cons. ad Apol.</i>	<i>Consolatio ad Apollonium: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 1
<i>De lib. ed.</i>	<i>De Liberis Educandis: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 1
<i>De tranq.</i>	<i>De Tranquillitate Animi: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 3
<i>Plac. Phil.</i>	<i>Placita Philosophorum: Plutarchi Moralia</i> Vol. 5.2.1 ed. J. Mau. Leipzig 1971 [BT]
Polemo	M. Gigante, "I Frammenti di Polemone Academico," <i>Rendiconti della Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti</i> (Naples) N.S. 51 (1976–1977) 91–144
Poll.	<i>Pollucis Onomasticon</i> ed. E. Bethe. 2 vols. Leipzig 1900. 1931 [LG 9.1–2]
Porph.	<i>Porphyrri Philosophi Fragmenta</i> ed. A. Smith. Leipzig 1993 [BT]
Praxiphanes	F. Wehrli, <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> . Vol. 9 <i>Phainias von Eresos. Chamaileon. Praxiphanes</i> . Basel & Stuttgart ² 1969
Procl. <i>In Alc.</i>	<i>Proclus. Sur le Premier Alcibiade de Platon</i> , Vol. 2 ed. A.Ph. Segonds. Paris 1986 [CB]
Quint. <i>Inst.</i>	<i>M. Fabii Quintiliani Institutionis Oratoriae Libri Duodecim</i> ed. M. Winterbottom. 2 vols. Oxford 1970 [OCT]
Ruf.	Rufus Ephesius, see Oribasius
Satyr. <i>Vit. Eur.</i>	<i>Satiro. Vita di Euripide</i> ed. G. Arrighetti. Pisa 1964
Scholia in Aristophanem	<i>Scholia Vetera in Nubes</i> ed. D. Holwerda. Groningen 1977 [SA 3.1]
Seleucus	M. Müller, <i>De Seleuco Homérico</i> . Diss. Göttingen 1891
S.E. <i>M.</i>	<i>Sexti Empirici Opera</i> Vol. 3 <i>Adversus Mathematicos</i> ed. J. Mau. Leipzig 1961 [BT]
Socrates	in SSR 1
Acosta Méndez	<i>Filodemo. Testimonianze su Socrate</i> edd. E. Acosta Méndez & A. Angeli. Naples 1992

- Sosicr. Rhod. Sosicrates Rhodius: *I Frammenti delle «Successioni dei Filosofi»* ed. R. Giannattasio Andria. Naples 1989
- Sotion F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Supplementband 2 *Sotion*. Basel & Stuttgart 1978
- Sotion Paradox. Sotion Paradoxographus: ΠΑΡΑΔΟΞΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ. *Scriptores Rerum Mirabilium Graeci* ed. A. Westermann. Braunschweig 1839, 183–91
- Speus. *Speusippo. Frammenti* ed. M. Isnardi Parente. Naples 1980
- Tarán L. Tarán, *Speusippus of Athens. A Critical Study with a Collection of the Related Texts and Commentary*. Leiden 1981
- St. Byz. *Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum Quae Supersunt* ed. A. Meineke. Vol. 1. Berlin 1849
- Stob. *Anth.* *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium* edd. C. Wachsmuth et O. Hense. 5 vols. Berlin 1884–1912
- Strabo *Strabons Geographika* ed. S.L. Radt. Vol. 1 (I–IV), Vol. 2 (V–VIII), Vol. 3 (IX–XIII). Göttingen 2002. 2003. 2004.
- Meineke *Strabonis Geographica* ed. A. Meineke. 3 vols. Leipzig 1852 [BT]
- Strato F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Vol. 5 *Straton von Lampsakos* Basel & Stuttgart ²1969
- Suda* *Suidae Lexicon* ed. A. Adler. 4 vols. Leipzig 1928–35 [LG 1]
- Themistius *Themistii Orationes Quae Supersunt* edd. G. Downey, A.F. Norman. Vol. 2. Leipzig 1971 [BT]
- Oppermann S. Oppermann, Θεμίστιος, I. Εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ πατέρα, II. Βασανιστὴς φιλόσοφος (20. und 21. Rede). Diss. Göttingen 1962
- Thphr. see FHS&G under (a)
- Char.* *Théophraste. Caractères* ed. O. Navarre. Paris ³1964 [CB]
- Diggle J. Diggle, *Theophrastus. Characters*. Cambridge 2005
- Theopomp. Theopompus of Chios: 115 *FGrH* II B 526–617
- Val. Max. *Valeri Maximi Facta et Dicta Memorabilia* ed. J. Briscoe. 2 vols. Leipzig 1998 [BT]
- Varro A. Riese, *M. Terenti Varronis Saturarum Menippearum Reliquiae*. Leipzig 1865
- Vita Aristotelis* *BIOΓΡΑΦΟΙ. Vitarum Scriptores Graeci Minores* ed. A. Westermann. Braunschweig 1845
- Düring *Vita Hesychii*, in: *Arist. Fragmenta* ed. I. Düring, 80–93
- Gigon *Vita Hesychii*, in: *Arist. Fragmenta* ed. O. Gigon, 26–8
- Rose *Hesychius*, in: *Arist. Fragmenta* ed. V. Rose, 9–18
- Vitr.* *Vitruve De l'Architecture Livre VIII* ed. L. Callebaut. Paris 1973 [CB]
- Rose *Vitruvii De Architectura Libri Decem* ed. V. Rose. Leipzig 1899 [BT]
- Zeno Stoic. Zeno Citieus: *SVF* 1.3–71

(c) Studies cited in this edition

- Acosta 1983 E. Acosta Méndez, "Diogenes Laertius X 14, 1–2," in: Συζή-
τησις. *Studi sull'Epicureismo Greco e Romano offerti a Mar-
cello Gigante*. Naples 1983, 121–32
- Acosta & Angeli see Socrates
- Alfonsi 1955 L. Alfonsi, "Sulle Fonti del *De Senectute*," *PP* 10 (1955) 121–9
- Alfonsi 1957 L. Alfonsi, "Su Aristone di Ceo," *Aevum* 31 (1957) 366–7
- Angeli 1994 A. Angeli, "Lo svolgimento dei papiri carbonizzati," *Papyro-
logica Lupiensia* 3 (1994) 37–104
- Arnim see *SVF* under (a)
- Arnim 1900 H. von Arnim, *De Aristonis Peripatetici apud Philodemum
Vestigiis*. Programm Rostock 1900
- Arnott 2000 G. Arnott, "Athenaeus and the Epitome. Texts, Manuscripts and
Early Editions," in: D. Braund & J. Wilkins (eds.), *Athenaeus
and his World*. Exeter 2000, 41–52
- Bassi 1913 D. Bassi, "Papiri Ercolanesi Disegnati," *RFIC* 41 (1913) 427–64
- Brink K.O. Brink, "Peripatos," *RE* Suppl. 7 (1940) 899–949
- Büchner 1941 W. Büchner, "Über den Begriff der Eironeia," *Hermes* 76 (1941)
339–58
- Bywater 1882 I. Bywater, "Atakta," *JPh* 10 (1882) 67–79
- Capasso 1983 M. Capasso, "Epicureismo e Eraclito. Contributo alla ricostru-
zione della critica epicurea alla filosofia presocratica," in: L.
Rossetti (ed.), *Atti del Symposium Heracliteum 1981*. Rome
1983. Vol. 1, 423–57
- Capasso 1997 M. Capasso, "I titoli nei papiri Ercolanesi. II: Il primo esempio
di un titolo iniziale in un papiro Ercolanese (PHerc. 1457)," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, Beiheft 3 (1997) 146–54
- Capelle W. Capelle, "Lykon," *RE* 13 (1927) 2303–8 no. 14
- Caujolle-Goulet F. Caujolle-Zaslowsky & R. Goulet, "Ariston de Céos," in *DPhA*
1 (1989) 398–400 no. 396
- Corvisier 2000 J.-N. Corvisier, "Athenaeus, Medicine and Demography," in: D.
Braund & J. Wilkins (eds.), *Athenaeus and his World*. Exeter
2000, 492–502
- Crönert *MGH* W. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis*. Leipzig 1903
- Crönert *KuM* W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos*. Leipzig 1906
- Crusius 1889 O. Crusius, "ΔΗΛΙΟΣ ΚΟΛΥΜΒΗΤΗΣ," *Philologus* 47 (1889)
382–4
- Dahlmann 1941 H. Dahlmann, review of Müller 1938 in: *Gnomon* 17 (1941)
168–83
- Dahlmann 1956 H. Dahlmann, "Catus oder Cato? Noch einmal der Titel von
Varros Logistoricus," in: *Navicula Chiloniensis*. Festschrift F.
Jacoby. Leiden 1956, 114–22
- Dorandi & Stein 1994 T. Dorandi & M. Stein, "Der älteste Textzeuge für den APEC-
KOC des Theophrast," *ZPE* 100 (1994) 1–16
- Dorandi T. Dorandi, "I Frammenti Papiracei di Aristone di Ceo," in this
volume

- Dürr 1987 E. Dürr, "Bemerkungen zu einer Neuausgabe von Philodem, *De vitiis* X (*PHerc.* 1008)," *CErc* 17 (1987) 135–8
- Edelstein 1955 L. Edelstein, review of F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vols. 4, 5, 6, 7, *AJPh* 76 (1955) 414–22
- Ellis 1876 R. Ellis, "On three Greek epigrams in Vitruvius," *The Journal of Philology* 6 (1876) 273–7
- Fornara 1966 Ch.W. Fornara, "Sources of Plutarch's 'An seni sit gerenda res publica'," *Philologus* 110 (1966) 119–27
- Gallavotti 1927 C. Gallavotti, "Teofrasto e Aristone (Per la genesi dei Caratteri teofrastei)," *RFIC* N.S. 5 (55) (1927) 468–79
- Gallavotti 1933 C. Gallavotti, review of Knögel 1933, *BFC* 40 (1933) 29–33
- Gallavotti 1975 C. Gallavotti, "Empedocle nei Papiri Ercolanesi," in: J. Bingen, G. Cambier, G. Nachtergaele (eds.), *Le Monde Grec. Hommages à Claire Préaux*. Brussels 1975, 153–61
- Gercke 1892 A. Gercke, "Ariston," *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* 5 (1892) 198–216
- Gercke *RE* A. Gercke, "Ariston," *RE* 2 (1896) 953–6 no. 52
- Gerhard 1905 G.A. Gerhard, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des griechischen Briefes I. Die Formel ὁ δεινὰ τῷ δεινὶ χαίρειν," *Philologus* 64 (1905) 27–65
- Giesecke 1891 A. Giesecke, *De Philosophorum Veterum Quae ad Exilium Spectant Sententiis*. Diss. Leipzig 1891
- Giesecke 1892 A. Giesecke, "Der Stoiker Ariston von Chios," *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 38 (1892) 206–10
- Gigante 1961 M. Gigante, "A Diogene Laerzio X 14," *Athenaeum* 39 (1961) 24–5
- Gigante 1977 M. Gigante, "Atakta II: VI. Philodemus est: non legitur," *CErc* 7 (1977) 41–2 (= *Atakta*, Naples 1993, 122–3)
- Gigante 1996a M. Gigante, "Aristone di Ceo biografo dei filosofi," *Studi Classici e Orientali* 46,1 1996 (1998) 17–23
- Gigante 1996b M. Gigante, "Atakta XV: LXXXII. La chiusa del libro filodemo La superbia e l'estensione di alcune opere di Filodemo," *CErc* 26 (1996) 131–2
- Gigante 1996c M. Gigante, "Atakta XV: LXXXI. Dubia de Jensenii editione Philodemi De vitiis X (Lipsiae 1911)," *CErc* 26 (1996) 131
- Gigante 1997a M. Gigante, "Atakta XVI: XCII. Trattato epistolare sul liberarsi dalla superbia del peripatetico Aristone," *CErc* 27 (1997) 153–4
- Gigante 1997b M. Gigante, "I sette tipi dell'archetipo 'il superbo' in Aristone di Ceo," in: U. Criscuolo & R. Maisano (eds.), *Synodia. Studia Humanitatis Antonio Garzya septuagenario ab amicis atque discipulis dicata*. Naples 1997, 345–56
- Gigante 1998 M. Gigante, "Atakta XVII: CI. Margitomanes," *CErc* 28 (1998) 112
- Gigante 2000a M. Gigante, "Aristone di Ceo e Aristofane in Filodemo," *SFIC* 93 (2000) 146–8

- Gigante 2000b M. Gigante, "Libri morali di Filodemo," *CErc* 30 (2000) 119–24
- Gigon 1958 O. Gigon, "Interpretationen zu den antiken Aristoteles-Viten," *MH* 15 (1958) 147–93
- Gigon 1959 O. Gigon, "Bibliographisches zur griechischen Philosophiegeschichte," *MH* 16 (1959) 69–73
- Glucker, *Antiochus* J. Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*. Göttingen 1978
- Gomperz 1912 *Hellenika: eine Auswahl philologischer und philosophiegeschichtlicher kleiner Schriften von Theodor Gomperz*, Vol. 1. Leipzig 1912
- Gottschalk 1972 H.B. Gottschalk, "Notes on the Wills of the Peripatetic Schoolarchs," *Hermes* 100 (1972) 312–42
- Gottschalk 1973 H.B. Gottschalk, "Addenda Peripatetica," *Phronesis* 18 (1973) 91–100
- Gottschalk 1980 H.B. Gottschalk, "Varro and Ariston of Chios," *Mnemosyne* 33 (1980) 359–62
- Grilli 1971 A. Grilli, "Un frammento d'Aristone Alessandrino in Porfirio," *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 23 (1971) 292–307
- Guérard C. Guérard, "Ariston de Chios," in *DPhA* 1 (1989) 400–3 no. 397
- Hahm D.E. Hahm, "Who Was Aristo of Ceos?," in this volume
- Hartman 1916 J.J. Hartman, *De Plutarcho Scriptore et Philosopho*. Leiden 1916
- Hecker 1852 A. Hecker, *Commentationis Criticae de Anthologia Graeca Pars prior*. Leiden 1852
- Heinze 1890 R. Heinze, "Ariston von Chios bei Plutarch und Horaz," *RhM* 45 (1890) 497–523
- Hense 1890 O. Hense, "Ariston bei Plutarch," *RhM* 45 (1890) 541–54
- Heringa *Adriani Heringa med. doct. Observationum Criticarum Liber Singularis*. Leeuwarden 1749
- Indelli 2001 G. Indelli, "Per una nuova edizione del *PHerc.* 1008 (Filodemo, *Ivizi*, libro X)," in: I. Andorlini, G. Bastianini, M. Manfredi, G. Menci (eds.), *Atti del XXII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Firenze, 23–29 agosto 1998*. Florence 2001, 693–8
- Indelli 2003 G. Indelli, "Noterelle ercolanesi 5," *CErc* 33 (2003) 319–22
- Ioppolo 1980 A.M. Ioppolo, *Aristone di Chio e lo Stoicismo Antico*. Naples 1980
- Ioppolo 1996 A.M. Ioppolo, "Ἰ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΚΟΥΦΙΖΕΙΝ ΥΠΕΡΦΑΝΙΑΣ: una polemica antisettica in Filodemo?," in: G. Giannantoni & M. Gigante (eds.), *Epicureismo Greco e Romano*. Naples 1996, II 715–34
- Jacoby 1902 see Apollodor.
- Jensen 1911 C. Jensen, "Ariston von Keos bei Philodem," *Hermes* 46 (1911) 393–406
- Jensen 1930 C. Jensen, "Die Bibliothek von Herculaneum," *Bonner Jahrbücher* 135 (1930) 49–61
- Jensen 1933 C. Jensen, *Ein neuer Brief Epikurs*. Berlin 1933
- Kassel 1985 R. Kassel, "Der Peripatetiker Prytanis," *ZPE* 60 (1985) 23–4 (= *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin & New York 1991, 351–2)

- Kleve 1983 K. Kleve, "Scurra Atticus. The Epicurean View of Socrates," *Syzêtêsis. Studi sull'epicureismo greco e romano offerti a Marcello Gigante*. Naples 1983, I 227–53
- Knögel 1933 see Aristo Ceus
- Kronenberg 1924 A.J. Kronenberg, "Ad Plutarchi Moralia," *Mnemosyne* 52 (1924) 61–112
- Laks 1976 A. Laks, "Édition critique et commentée de la 'Vie d'Épicure' dans Diogène Laërce (X, 1–34)," in: J. Bollack & A. Laks (eds.), *Études sur l'Épicurisme Antique*. Lille 1976, 1–118
- Lancia 1980 M. Lancia, "Aristone di Ceo e Bione di Boristene," *Elenchos* 1 (1980) 276–91
- Longo 1986 F. Longo Auricchio, "Sulla concezione filodemea dell'adulazione," *CErc* 16 (1986) 79–91
- Mansfeld 1985 J. Mansfeld, review of Ioppolo 1980, in: *Mnemosyne* 38 (1985) 209–15
- Mayer 1907–10 A. Mayer, *Aristonstudien*, *Philologus* Supplementband 11 (1907–1910) 485–610
- MorauX 1951 MorauX, P., *Les Listes Anciennes des Ouvrages d'Aristote*. Louvain 1951
- MorauX 1986 P. MorauX, "Diogène Laërce et le *Peripatos*," *Elenchos* 7 (1986) 247–94
- Mouraviev 1987 S.N. Mouraviev, "La *Vie d'Héraclite* de Diogène Laërce. Analyse stratigraphique—Le texte de base—Un nouveau fragment d'Ariston de Céos?," *Phronesis* 32 (1987) 1–33
- Mras 1955 K. Mras, "Ariston von Keos (in einem zweiten Bruchstück von Plutarchs Στρωματεῖς)," *WS* 68 (1955) 88–98
- Müller 1938 R. Müller, *Varros Logistoricus über Kindererziehung*. Leipzig 1938
- Nardelli 1984 M.L. Nardelli, "L'ironia in Polistrato e Filodemo," *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*. Naples 1984. II, 525–36
- Nauck 1889 A. Nauck, "Analecta critica," *Hermes* 24 (1889) 447–72
- Page see *FGE*
- Pasquali 1918–19 G. Pasquali, "Sui 'Caratteri' di Teofrasto," *Rassegna Italiana di Lingue e Letterature Classiche* 1 (1918) 73–9 & 143–50; 2 (1919) 1–21 (= *Scritti Filologici*. Florence 1986, I, 47–96)
- Patzig 1876 H. Patzig, *Quaestiones Plutarchaeae*. Diss. Berlin 1876
- Philippson 1912 R. Philippson, review of Jensen Phld. *Vit.*, *PhW* 32 (1912) 389–93
- Philippson 1921 R. Philippson, "Diogenes Laertius X 14," *PhW* 41 (1921) 911–2
- Philippson 1934 R. Philippson, review of Knögel 1933, *PhW* 54 (1934) 1329–34
- Philippson 1938 R. Philippson, "Philodemos," *RE* 19 (1938) 2443–82
- Pohlenz *Die Stoa* M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, 2. Band *Erläuterungen*. Göttingen 1949
- Porter 1994 J.I. Porter, "Stoic Morals and Poetics in Philodemos," *CErc* 24 (1994) 63–88

- Pothecary 1997 S. Pothecary, "The expression 'our times' in Strabo's *Geography*," *CPh* 92 (1997) 235–46
- Preger see *IGM*
- Ranocchia 2001 G. Ranocchia, "Filodemo e il ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΚΟΥΦΙΖΕΙΝ ΥΠΕΡ-ΗΦΑΝΙΑΣ. Contributo ad una nuova edizione del *PHerc* 1008," *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 10 (2001) 231–63
- Ranocchia 2003 G. Ranocchia, "Aristo Ceus o Aristo Chius? Postilla al problema testuale di Cic. *Cato Maior* 3," *Elenchos* 24 (2003) 115–22
- Ranocchia G. Ranocchia, "L'autore del ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΚΟΥΦΙΖΕΙΝ ΥΠΕΡ-ΗΦΑΝΙΑΣ: un problema riaperto," in this volume
- Reutern, von 1933 G. von Reutern, *Plutarchs Stellung zur Dichtkunst. Interpretation der Schrift "De audiendis poetis."* Diss. Kiel 1933
- Rieth 1936 O. Rieth, review of Knögel 1933, *Gnomon* 12 (1936) 618–19
- Ritschl 1842 F. Ritschl, "Aristo der Peripatetiker bei Cicero de Senect. §.□3," *RhM* 1 (1842) 193–200 (= *Opuscula Philologica* I, Leipzig 1865, 551–9)
- Rostagni 1955 A. Rostagni, "Sui «Caratteri» di Teofrasto," in: *Scritti Minori*, I *Aesthetica*. Turin 1955, 327–55
- Saal 1852 N. Saal, *De Aristone Chio et Herillo Carthaginensi Stoicis Commentatio*, Pars 1: *De Aristonis Chii Vita, Scriptis et Doctrina*. Cologne 1852
- Searby D.M. Searby, "A preliminary survey of the sayings of Aristo," in this volume
- Sharples R.W. Sharples, "Natural Philosophy in the Peripatos after Strato," in this volume
- Sollenberger 1992 M.G. Sollenberger, "The Lives of the Peripatetics: An Analysis of the Contents and Structure of Diogenes Laertius' 'Vitae philosophorum' Book 5," *ANRW* II 36.6 (1992) 3793–3879
- Susemihl *GGL* F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*. 2 vols. Leipzig 1891–2.
- Tsekourakis 1980 D. Tsekourakis, "Zwei Probleme der «Aristonfrage»," *RhM* 123 (1980) 238–57
- Tsouna 2004 V. Tsouna, "Philodemus On Arrogance. Introduction, translation and notes," in: J. Fitzgerald & E. Asmis (eds.), *Society of Biblical Literature: Texts and Translations*. Atlanta 2004
- Tsouna V. Tsouna, "Aristo on Blends of Arrogance," in this volume
- Vogt S. Vogt, "Characters in Aristo," in this volume
- Weber 1896 H. Weber, "Zu Ariston von Chios," *RhM* 51 (1896) 630–2
- Wehrli see Aristo Ceus
- Wehrli RE F. Wehrli, "Ariston von Iulis auf Keos," RE Suppl. 11 (1968) 156–9
- Zeller 1879 E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. II 2 *Aristoteles und die alten Peripatetiker*. Leipzig 41921
- Zoumpos 1964 A.N. Zoumpos, "Zu Diogenes Laertius (= IX, 12)," *ZAnt* 13–14 (1964) 73–4

24 Aristo of Ceos

Zucchelli 1981 B. Zucchelli, *Varro Logistoricus. Studio Letterario e Prosopografico*. Florence 1981

(d) Other abbreviations

a.	anno/annis	del.	delevit/deleverunt
aCn	ante Christum natum	F	fragmentum
add.	addidit	fort.	fortasse
adn.	adnotatio	lac.	lacuna
al.	alii	litt.	littera, -ae etc.
ap.	apud	marg.	(in) margine
app.	apparatus criticus	om.	omisit/omiserunt
cett.	ceteri	pCn	post Christum natum
cf.	confer	secl.	secluit
codd.	codices	ss.	superscriptum, -o
coll.	collato/collatis	s.v.	sub voce
coni.	coniecit	T	testimonium
corr.	correxit	vid.	vide
γρ.	γράφεται	*	not in Wehrli
ed(d).	editor(es)/edidit/ediderunt	***	lacuna

(e) Symbols used in the apparatus

<a>	littera suppleta/addenda
[a]	littera spuria, eliminanda
†...†	locus nondum sanatus
in papyris:	
—	paragraphus ad sinistram subter versus clausulam continentis initium a librario posita
>—	capitis clausula eodem modo a librario notata
αβγ	litterae mutilae vel dubiae
[αβγ]	litterae valde incertae
[αβγ]	litterae a librario expunctae
{αβγ}	litterae ab editore expunctae
`αβγ'	litterae supra lineam scriptae
<αβγ>	litterae ab editore additae
[αβγ]	litterae ab editore suppletae
[. . .]	litterae deperditae
. . .	reliquiae litterarum



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

I. VITA

- 1 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 7.164 (BT 1.542.10–13 Marcovich)

¹ W γέγονε δὲ καὶ ἄλλος Ἀρίστων Ἰουλιήτης Περιπατητικός, ὁ δὲ τις μουσικὸς Ἀθηναῖος, τέταρτος ποιητῆς τραγωδίας, πέμπτος Ἀλαιοὺς τέχνας γεγραφῶς ῥητορικῶς, ἕκτος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς Περιπατητικός.

1 Ἰουλιήτης] *vid.* **2A–B** 1–2 *Aristo Ceus T 1 Knögel* || Περιπατητικός] *vid.* **2A.7; 2B.4; 8.18; 10.2; 13A.8; 17A.14; 17C.1; cf. 6.4 et 31.6** 2 ὁ δὲ τις μουσικὸς] *RE* 2 (1896) 952 [41] || τέταρτος] *I46 T 3 TrGF I; RE* 2 (1896) 952 [49]; *DNP* 1 (1996) 1116 [1] 4 Ἀλεξανδρεὺς Περιπατητικός] *Aristo Alex. T 4 Mariotti*

[BPF = Ω = *hyparchetypon*] 1 ἰουληήτης *F* 2 τις Ω: τρίτος *Madvig, Adv. crit. I*, 1871, 716

- 2A** Strabo, *Geographica* 10.5.6 486,19–24 C. (3.276.16–21 Radt)

6 Κέως δὲ τετράπολις μὲν ὑπῆρξε, λείπονται δὲ δύο, ἢ τε Ἰουλὶς καὶ ἡ Καρθαία, εἰς ἃς συνεπολίσθησαν αἱ λοιπαί, ἢ μὲν Ποιήεσσα εἰς τὴν Καρθαίαν, ἢ δὲ Κορησία εἰς τὴν Ἰουλίδαν. ἐκ δὲ τῆς Ἰουλίδος ὅ τε Σιμωνίδης ἦν ὁ μελοποιὸς καὶ Βακχυλίδης, ἀδελφιδοῦς 5 ἐκείνου, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα Ἑρασίστρατος ὁ ἰατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Περιπάτου φιλοσόφων Ἀρίστων, ὁ τοῦ Βορυσθενίτου Βίωνος ζηλωτής.

4–8 *Aristo Ceus T 2 Knögel; Erasistratus F 4A Garofalo; Bion T 24 Kindstrand* 4 ἐκ δὲ τῆς Ἰουλίδος] *cf.* **1.1 et 2B.4–5** 7 ἐκ τοῦ Περιπάτου] *vid. ad 1.1–2*

[*BCD et nqxe*] 3–4 Κορησία *Meineke (Vind. 181)* : -ησσία *codd.* 4 ὅ τε *q* : ὅτι *BCD* : *om. nxe* 6 μετὰ ταῦτα] μετ' αὐτὸν *St. Byz.* (-τῶν *R*) (**2B**) *post* ἰατρὸς

I. LIFE

- 1 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 7.164 (BT 1.542.10–13 Marcovich)

There has also been another Aristo, from Iulis,¹ a Peripatetic; and another one, a musician of Athens; a fourth, a tragic poet; a fifth, of Alae, author of treatises on rhetoric; a sixth, from Alexandria, a Peripatetic.²

¹ On the isle of Ceos, see **2A–B**.

² This list of persons called Aristo (homonyms) is part of the *Life* of Aristo of Chios. The list is separated from the catalogue of the writings of Aristo of Chios (**8**) by a short paragraph on the manner of Aristo's death and an epigram on him by Diogenes Laertius.

- 2A** Strabo, *Geography* 10.5.6 486,19–24 C. (3.276.16–21 Radt)

- 6 Originally Ceos consisted of four towns, but only two remain, Iulis and Carthaea. Into these the other two were incorporated, Poiëessa into Carthaea, Coresia into Iulis. (A native) of Iulis was Simonides the melic poet and also Bacchylides, his nephew, and after their time Erasistratus the physician¹ and one of the philosophers from the Peripatos, Aristo, the emulator of Bion of Borysthenes.²

¹ Erasistratos [2] *RE* 6 (1909) 333–50 (ca. 315–ca. 240 B.C.).

² Bion of Borysthenes ca. 335–245 B.C. On Aristo as “emulator” of Bion, see Kindstrand on Bion T 24 p. 171 and p. 79–87, who argues “that there is a mistake in Strabo, and that the Stoic Ariston of Chios and not the Peripatetic Ariston of Ceos should be considered as the emulator of Bion”; cp. Ioppolo 1980, 301–5. For the opposite view, see Lancia 1980 and Tsekourakis 1980, 248–57.

2B Stephanus Byzantius, *Ethnica* s.v. Ἰουλίς (1.335.5–8 Meineke)

2b W Ἰουλίς, πόλις ἐν Κέῳ τῇ νήσῳ, ἀπὸ Ἰουλίδος κρή-
νης. ἀφ' ἧς Σιμωνίδης ἐστὶν ὁ μελοποιὸς καὶ Βακχυλί-
δης ὁ ἀδελφιδοῦς ἐκείνου καὶ Ἑρασίστρατος ἰατρὸς
μετ' αὐτὸν καὶ Ἀρίστων ὁ Περιπατητικός. οὗτοι Ἰου-
λιῆται. 5

1–4 *Aristo Ceus* T 2 *Knögel*; *Erasistratus* F 4B *Garofalo* 4 ὁ Περι-
πατητικός] *vid. ad* 1.1–2 4–5 Ἰουλιῆται] *cf. 1.1 et* 2A.4

[RV] 1 Κέῳ *Xylander*: Κῶ *RV* 4 μετ' αὐτὸν *V*: μετ' αὐτῶν *R*: μετὰ
ταῦτα *Strabo* (2A) *ante* 3 Ἑρασίστρατος

3 Plutarchus, *De exilio* 14 605A–C (BT 3.525.23–526.15 Paton et al.)

14 εἰ δὲ φήσῃ τις ὅτι δόξαν οὗτοι καὶ τιμὰς ἐθήρευν,
ἐπὶ τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐλθὲ καὶ τὰς σοφὰς Ἀθήνησι σχολὰς
καὶ διατριβάς· ἀναπέμπασαι τὰς ἐν Λυκείῳ τὰς ἐν
3 W Ἀκαδημείᾳ τὴν Στοὰν τὸ Παλλάδιον τὸ Ὠιδεῖον. εἰ
τὴν Περιπατητικὴν ἀσπάζῃ μάλιστα καὶ τεθαύμα- 5
B κας, Ἀριστοτέλης ἦν ἐκ Σταγίρων, Θεόφραστος ἐξ
Ἑρέσου, Στράτων ἐκ Λαμψάκου, Λύκων ἐκ Τρωάδος,
Ἀρίστων ἐκ Κέῳ, Κριτόλαος Φασηλῆτης· εἰ τὴν Στωι-
κὴν, Ζήνων Κιτιεύς, Κλεάνθης Ἀσσιος, Χρύσιππος
Σολεύς, Διογένης Βαβυλώνιος, Ἀντίπατρος Ταρσεύς, 10
ὁ δ' Ἀθηναῖος Ἀρχέδημος εἰς τὴν Πάρθων μεταστάς
ἐν Βαβυλῶνι Στωικὴν διαδοχὴν ἀπέλιπε. τίς οὖν τού-
τους ἐδίωξεν; οὐδεὶς· ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ διώκοντες ἡσυχίαν,
ἧς οὐ πάνυ μέτεστιν οἴκοι τοῖς ἡντιναοῦν δόξαν ἢ δύ-
ναμιν ἔχουσι, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα λόγοις τοῦτο δ' ἔργοις 15
C κράτιστοι ζῶσιν ἐπὶ ξένης οὐ μετασταθέντες ἀλλὰ
μεταστάντες, οὐδὲ φυγαδευθέντες ἀλλὰ φυγόντες
αὐτοὶ πράγματα καὶ περισπασμούς καὶ ἀσχολίας, ὥς

2B Stephanus of Byzantium, *Ethnica* under *Iulis* (1.335.5–8 Meineke)

Iulis, a town on the island of Ceos, (named) after a fountain Iulis. From this place is Simonides the melic poet and Bacchylides his nephew and Erasistratus (the) physician after him and Aristo the Peripatetic. These (men are) from Iulis.¹

¹ See notes 1 and 2 on **2A**.

3 Plutarch, *On Exile* 14 605A–C (BT 3.525.23–526.15 Paton *et al.*)

- 14 And if anyone will say that these men were chasing after renown and honors,¹ go to the wise men and the wise schools and seminars at Athens.² Consider those in the Lyceum, those in the Academy, the Stoa, the Palladium, the Odeon.³ If you embrace and
B admire the Peripatetic (school) most, Aristotle was from Stagira, Theophrastus from Eresus, Strato from Lampsacus, Lyco from the Troad, Aristo from Ceos, Critolaus was a Phaselian. If (you favor) the Stoic (school), Zeno (was) from Citium, Cleanthes from Assos, Chrysippus from Soli, Diogenes from Babylon, Antipater from Tarsus, and the Athenian Archdemus moved to the land of the Parthians and left behind him a succession of Stoics in Babylon. Who pursued these men? No one. It was they themselves who pursued quiet,⁴ which is hardly to be found at home in persons who possess any renown or power whatsoever. That is what they teach us, not by their words as other things, but by their actions. For in
C our time too the most highly esteemed and powerful men live on foreign soil, not because they have been made to move but because they themselves have moved, nor because they have been made refugees but because they themselves have escaped troubles and

αὶ πατρίδες φέρουσι.

20

1–20 *Lyco* 2 *SFOD* 1–16 *Thphr.* 25 *FHS&G* 4–9 *Aristo Ceus* *T* 7a *Knögel* 4–8 *Lyco* *F* 1 *Wehrli* 6–18 Ἀριστοτέλης—μεταστάντες] *Stob.*, *Anth.* 3.40.3/4 (3.736.8–737.4 *Hense*), *omissis* 8–12 Κριτόλαος—ἀπέλιπε 6–8 *Critolaus* *F* 1 *Wehrli* 7 *Strato* *F* 4,1 *Wehrli* 8 ἐκ Κέω] *vid.* **2A–B**; **5**.15–16; **10**.2; **12**.1; **13A**.8; **13B**.5; **14A**.10; **16**.4; **18**.3 9 *cf.* *D.L.* 7.1 = *Zeno* *F* 1 *SVF* || *cf.* *D.L.* 7.168 = *Cleanth.* *F* 463 *SVF* || *cf.* *D.L.* 7.179 = *Chrysipp.* *F* 1 *SVF* 10 *Diog. Bab.* *F* 2 *SVF* || *Antip.* *F* 6 *SVF* 11 *Arched.* *F* 2 *SVF* 16–20 *cf.* *Muson.* *p.* 43,8–16

[*Jv(w)αAEβ n*; *Ald.*² = *notae Leonici margini Aldinae Hamburgensis adscriptae*] 7 ἐφέσου *codd.*, *corr. editio Aldina Basileensis* 1542: ἐρεσίου *Stob.* || Λύκων] γλύκων *codd.*, *corr. Xylander*: γλαύκων δὲ *Stob.* 8 εἰ *n*: εἰς *cett.* 9 Ἀσσιος] λύδιος *codd.*, *corr. Ald.*² 13 ἡσυχίαν καὶ σπουδὴν *Stob.* 15–16 δὲ ἡμᾶς ἔργῳ *Stob.*

4A *Vita Aristotelis Hesychii* 9 (p. 82.18–21 Düring)

- 7 W 9 διάδοχοι δ' αὐτοῦ τῆς σχολῆς κατὰ τάξιν ἐγένοντο οἷδε· Θεόφραστος, Στράτων, Πραξιτέλης, Λύκων, Ἀρίστων, Λυκίσκος, Πραξιφάνης, Ἱερώνυμος, Πρύτανις, Φορμίων, Κριτόλαος.

1–4 *Vita Aristotelis Menagiana* 402.20–3 *Westermann*; *Arist.*, *Fragm.* 10.19–22 *Rose* = *Gigon* 26a.33–6; *Strato* *F* 3 *Wehrli*; *Lyco* 3B *SFOD* = *F* 6 *Wehrli*; *Hieronym.* 3 *White* = *F* 2 *Wehrli*; *Praxiphanes* *F* 3 *Wehrli*; *Critolaus* *F* 3 *Wehrli* 1–3 *Aristo Ceus* *T* 7b *Knögel* 1–2 *Thphr.* 11 *no.* 7 *FHS&G* 2 Πραξιτέλης] *RE* 22.2 (1954) 1808 [6] 2–3 Λύκων, Ἀρίστων] *cf.* **3**.7–8; **4B**.3–4; **5**.11; **6**.4; **9**.6–8 3 Πρύτανις] *RE* 23.1 (1957) 1158 [5]; *cf.* *Kassel* 1985, 23–4 4 Φορμίων] *RE* 20.1 (1941) 540 [8]

*4B *Clemens Alexandrinus, Stromata* 1.14.63.5 (*GCS* 2.40.9–12 *Stählin-Früchtel*)

- 5 παρὰ Πλάτωνι Ἀριστοτέλης φιλοσοφήσας μετελθὼν εἰς τὸ Λύκειον κτίζει τὴν Περιπατητικὴν αἵρεσιν. τοῦτον διαδέχεται Θεόφραστος, ὃν Στράτων, ὃν Λύκων, εἶτα Κριτόλαος, εἶτα Διόδωρος.

1–4 *Lyco* 3A *SFOD* 1–2 *cf.* *Arist.* *F* 3 *Düring* 260 3–4 *Thphr.* 11 *no.* 5 *FHS&G*; *Strato* *F* 4 *Wehrli*; *Lyco* *F* 1' *Wehrli*; *Critolaus* *F* 4 *Wehrli*; *Diodorus Tyrius* *F* 1 *Wehrli* || ὃν Λύκων] *vid. ad* **4A**.3–4

distractions and pressing business, which their home lands yield.

¹ In chapter 13 Plutarch has mentioned a number of literary figures who of their own free will either left Athens or came to it from their home country: Euripides went to Macedon; Aeschylus and Simonides to Sicily; Herodotus to Thuri; and what about Homer?

² On the distinction between *scholê* and *diatribê*, see J. Glucker, *Antiochus*, 160–6.

³ Clitomachus held his private school in the Palladium (Phld., *Acad. Hist.* col. 24.32–6; 25.8–11; 30.8–10); Chrysippus sometimes lectured in the Odeon (D.L. 7.184).

⁴ Diogenes is exploiting an ambiguity in the word διώκειν between “prosecuting” and “pursuing.”

4A *Vita Aristotelis Hesychii* 9 (p. 82.18–21 Düring)

9 Those who inherited the school from him (Aristotle) were,¹ in order, the following: Theophrastus, Strato, Praxiteles, Lyco, Aristo, Lyciscus, Praxiphanes, Hieronymus, Prytanis, Phormio, Critolaus.²

¹ On *scholê*, see 3 n. 2.

² See Wehrli on Aristo F 7 p. 49; on the different lists of scholarchs of the Peripatos, see Brink, *RE* Suppl. 7 (1940) 908–14. Cp. 4B.

*4B Clement of Alexandria, *Patchwork* 1.14.63.5 (GCS 2.40.9–12 Stählin-Früchtel)

5 After having studied philosophy with Plato, Aristotle moved to the Lyceum and founded the Peripatetic school.¹ His successor is Theophrastus, that of Theophrastus Strato, that of Strato Lyco, then Critolaus, then Diodorus.²

¹ On the term *hairesis* as distinct from *scholê* and *diatribê* (cp. 3 n. 2), see Glucker, *Antiochus*, 166–92.

² See 4A n. 2.

- 5 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 5.69; 70; 74 (BT 1. 357.8; 357.19–358.4; 360.6–11 Marcovich)

- 69 τοῦ δὲ φιλοσόφου καὶ διαθήκαις περιετύχονεν
ταῖσδε· . . .
- 6 W 70 “τὸν δὲ Περίπατον καταλείπω τῶν γνωρίμων τοῖς
βουλομένοις, Βούλωνι, Καλλίνῳ, Ἀρίστωνι, Ἀμφίωνι,
Λύκωνι, Πύθωνι, Ἀριστομάχῳ, Ἡρακλείῳ, Λυκο- 5
μήδει, Λύκωνι τῷ ἀδελφιδῷ. προστησάσθωσαν δὲ αὐ-
τοῖ ὃν ἂν ὑπολαμβάνωσι διαμενεῖν ἐπὶ τοῦ πράγματος
καὶ συνέξειν μάλιστα δυνήσεσθαι. συγκατασκευάζε-
τωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ γνώριμοι κάμοῦ καὶ τοῦ τόπου
χάριν.” . . . 10
- 74 “περὶ δὲ τῆς ταφῆς ἐάν τε αὐτοῦ βούληται Λύκων
θάπτειν, ἐάν τε ἐν οἴκῳ, οὕτω ποιείτω. πέπεισμαι γὰρ
αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ἦττον ἐμοῦ συνορᾶν τὸ εὖσχημον. ταῦτα
δὲ πάντα οἰκονομήσαντι κυρία ἔστω ἡ δόσις τῶν ἐν-
ταῦθα. μάρτυρες Καλλίνος Ἑρμιονεύς, Ἀρίστων Κεῖ- 15
ος, Εὐφρόνιος Παιανιεύς.”

1–16 *Lycos* 1.55–6; 67–74; 122–7 *SFOD* = *F* 15 *Wehrli* 1–4; 6–8; 15–
16 *Aristo Ceus* *T* 3 *Knögel* 3–8 *Laum* *SGRA* 16 3–4 τὸν δὲ
Περίπατον—βουλομένοις] *cf.* 5.52 15–16 Κεῖος] *vid. ad* 3.8

[*BPF* = Ω = *hyparchetypon*] 4 καὶ Καλλίνῳ *F* || Ἀμφίωνι *om.* *F* 7
διαμένειν Ω , *corr.* *Cobet* 8 συναύξειν *Cobet* 15 ἐρμίων·
εὐσαρίστων *B*

- 6 Themistius, *Orationes* 21 255b–c (BT 2.35.22–36.10 Downey-Norman)

- b διὰ τοῦτο ἡσπάζετο Ἀρίστων Κλεάνθην καὶ τῶν
ὁμιλητῶν ἐκοινώνει, διὰ τοῦτο Κράντορα Κράτης, διὰ
τοῦτο Σπεύσιππος ἐκ Χαλκηδόνος μετεπέμπετο Ξενο-
κράτην. Λύκων δὲ καὶ Ἀρίστων ὁ ἐκ Λυκείου ἄμφω 5
μὲν περὶ τοὺς Ἀριστοτέλους λόγους εἰχέτην, ἐν δόξῃ
δὲ ὧν ὁ Λύκων ἐπὶ παιδείᾳ τοσαύτῃ ὥστε καὶ τοὺς πο-
λεμίους διὰ τὸ κλέος ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ καθάπερ ἱερῶν
ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν Λύκωνος πλοίων, ὅμως οὐκ ἐδυσχέ-

4 W

5 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 5.69; 70; 74 (BT 1. 357.8; 357.19–358.4; 360.6–11 Marcovich)

69 We have also come across the philosopher's (Lyco's) will, which reads as follows:¹ . . .

70 "The Peripatos I leave to those of the members who wish to make use of it: to Bulo, Callinus, Aristo, Amphio, Lyco, Pytho, Aristomachus, Heracleus, Lycomedes, and Lyco my nephew.² They themselves are to put at their head (the person) who they assume will persevere in attending to the business (of the school) and will be best able to keep it together. But the remaining members too are to assist in effecting this purpose both for my sake and that of the place." . . .

74 "With regard to my burial, Lyco is to do as he wishes, whether he chooses to bury (me) here or at home. For I am convinced that he has no less an eye for what is befitting than I. When he has attended to all these things, the gift of the property here is to take effect. Witnesses (are) Callinus of Hermione, Aristo of Ceos, Euphronius of (the deme of) Paeania."

¹ In Lyco's will Aristo is mentioned twice: (1) as the third (after Bulo and Callinus) in the list of ten persons to whom Lyco leaves the Peripatos (l. 4); (2) as the second (after Callinus) of three witnesses to the will (l. 15–16). For the full text, see Lyco 1 SFOD. For the testaments of the Peripatetics and the collection made of them by Aristo, see 16 n. 2.

² On this manner of leaving the Peripatos jointly to a group of ten members, see Gottschalk 1972, 328–35.

6 Themistius, *Orations* 21 255b–c (BT 2.35.22–36.10 Downey-Norman)

b For that reason Aristo (of Chios) had a great affection for Cleanthes and shared pupils with him;¹ for that reason Crates (felt the same) for Crantor; for that reason Speusippus sent for Xenocrates (to come) from Chalcedon. As for Lyco and Aristo – the one from the Lyceum – both were engaged in studying the theories of Aristotle, but Lyco had so great a reputation for erudition that even enemies at sea, because of his fame, kept away from Lyco's ships as if they were sacred. Nevertheless he did not have

ραινει πρὸς τὸν Ἀρίστωνα τοῦτον οὐδὲ ἐκνίζετο ἐκ
 c προσεδρίας μᾶλλον ἐπιδιδόντα, ἀλλὰ συνωμολόγει 10
 μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ χαρίτων ὅτι ὁ χωλὸς τὸν ἀρτίποδα
 παρατρέχει. συνέβη γὰρ τῷ Ἀρίστωνι καὶ πεπηρῶσθαι
 τὸ σκέλος.

1–13 *Lycō 7 SFOD* 1–4 *Speus. F 20 Isnardi Parente = T 11 Tarán;*
Crantor T 4f Mette 1–2 *Aristo Chius F 334 SVF = F 1 5 FSA* 2
 Κράντορα Κράτης] cf. *D.L. 4.22* 3 Σπεύσιππος—Ξενοκράτην] cf.
D.L. 4.3 4–13 *Aristo Ceus T 4 Knögel; Lycō F 9 Wehrli* 4 Λύκων
 δὲ καὶ Ἀρίστων] vid. ad **4A.3–4** || ὁ ἐκ Λυκείου] vid. ad **1.1–2**

[*AHΦΞ et O = ,N,a,b,k,n,p,r,w,x*] 4 Λύκων *Φ¹aw marg.* : κύμων
AHΞ: κύκων *Φ²px* 5 περὶ] πρὸς *Wehrli* 10 προσεδρεία *ax*:
 προσεδρείας *ΞΦΟ cett.* || ἐπιδιδόντος *Capelle, RE 13 (1927) 2308,*
Wehrli 11 παιδείας (*vel -είας*) *H¹ΞΦ* 12 καὶ πεπηρῶσθαι]
 καταπεπηρῶσθαι *K. Deichgräber ap. Oppermann 1962, 38*

II. SCRIPTA

Inscriptiones Librorum

7 Tabula inscriptionum

Certa:

1 Ἐρωτικά Ὅμοια] *Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae* 15.16
 674B = **10.2–3** (ἐν β' Ἐρωτικῶν Ὅμοίων); 10.14 419C
 = **11.3–4** (ἐν Ἐρωτικῶν Ὅμοίων δευτέρῳ); 13.15 563F
 = **13A.8–9** (ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ περὶ τῶν Ἐρωτικῶν Ὅμοί-
 ων)

2 Λύκων] *Plutarchus, Quomodo adulescens poetas audire
 debeat* 1 14E = **15.6–7** (τὸν Λύκωνα τὸν Ἀρίστωνος)

confer quae *Diogenes Laertius, Vitae Philosophorum* 5.64 =
16.3–4, dicit de Stratonis testamento ab Aristone collecto.

Amphisbetoumena:

bad feelings towards this Aristo and was not grieved (to see him) making greater progress through application. Rather, he admitted with engaging playfulness that the lame outruns the sound of foot. For it so happened that Aristo actually had a crippled leg.

¹ In this oration Themistius is trying to define what characterizes the true philosopher. One of the characteristics of the philosopher, according to Themistius, is that he is willing to share his knowledge, especially with those who desire to be taught, and will not compete with his colleagues as a bronze-smith or a poet might do. “For once what is true has become visible and has shone forth in philosophy, all who have been engaged in this pursuit together benefit from it with no blood shed” (21 255a). First he mentions an example taken from the Stoa (Aristo of Chios and Cleanthes), then two taken from the Academy (Crates and Crantor, Speusippus and Xenocrates), and finally, as representatives of the Peripatos, Lyco and Aristo.

II. WRITINGS

Titles of Books

7 List of Titles

Certain:

- 1 *Erotic Examples*] Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 15.16 674B = **10.2**–3 (“in the second [book] of *Erotic Examples*”); 10.14 419C = **11.3**–4 (“in the second [book] of *Erotic Examples*”); 13.15 563F = **13A.8**–9 (“in the second [book] on the *Erotic Examples*”)
- 2 Lyco] Plutarch, *How A Young Man Ought to Study Poetry* 1 14E = **15.6**–7 (“the Lyco of Aristo”)

Compare what Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 5.64 = **16.3**–4, says about the will of Strato collected by Aristo.

Disputed:

- 3 Τιθωνός vel Περί Γήρωνος?] Cicero, *Cato Maior de Senectute* 1.3 = **18.2**–3 (omnem autem sermonem tribuimus non Tithono, ut Aristo Ceus)
 4 Περί κολακείας?] vide **19–20**
 5 Περί τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας?] Philodemus, *De viitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 10.11–13 = **21a.11**–13 (Περί τοῦ κο[υ]φίζ[ειν ὑ]περηφανίας ἐπιστολή[ν])
 6 Περί Ἑρακλείτου] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 9.5 = **23.6** (ἐν τῷ Περί Ἑρακλείτου)
 7 Ἐπικούρου Βίος] Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 10.14 = **25.15** (ἐν τῷ Ἐπικούρου βίῳ)

vide etiam catalogum scriptorum Aristonis Chii ap. Diogenem Laertium, *Vitae Philosophorum* 7.163 = **8**.

Non Recepta:

- 8 Ὁμοιώματα] Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 4.52a.18 = **47.1** (ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὁμοιωμάτων); 2.2.14; 2.2.23; 2.31.83; 2.31.95; 3.4.109; 3.13.40; 3.13.57; 4.25.44; 4.31d.110 **app. 47** (ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὁμοιωμάτων)

(Aristonis Chii) Catalogus scriptorum

- 8** Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae Philosophorum* 7.163 (BT 1.541.10–542.2 Marcovich)

⁹ w βιβλία δ' αὐτοῦ φέρεται τάδε·
 Προτρεπτικῶν β',
 Περί τῶν Ζήνωνος δογμάτων,
 Διάλογοι,
 Σχολῶν ζ',
 Περί σοφίας διατριβῶν ζ',
 Ἑρωτικά διατριβαί,
 Ὑπομνήματα ὑπὲρ κενοδοξίας,
 Ὑπομνημάτων κέ',
 Ἀπομνημονευμάτων γ',

5

10

- 3 *Tithonus* or *On Old Age?*] Cicero, *Cato Maior On Old Age* 1.3 = **18.2**–3 (“the entire discourse, however, we have attributed, not to Tithonus, as Aristo of Chios [did]”)
- 4 *On Flattery?*] see **19–20**
- 5 *On Relieving Arrogance?*] Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 10.11–13 = **21a.11**–13 (“a letter *On Relieving Arrogance*”)
- 6 *On Heraclitus*] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 9.5 = **23.6** (“in his [book] *On Heraclitus*”)
- 7 *Life of Epicurus*] Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 10.14 = **25.15** (“in his *Life of Epicurus*”)

See also the list of writings by Aristo of Chios in Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 7.163 = **8**.

Not Accepted:

- 8 *Comparisons*] Stobaeus, *Anthology* 4.52a.18 = **47.1** (“From the *Comparisons* of Aristo”); 2.2.14; 2.2.23; 2.31.83; 2.31.95; 3.4.109; 3.13.40; 3.13.57; 4.25.44; 4.31d.110 **app. 47** (“From the *Comparisons* of Aristo”)

List of Writings (of Aristo of Chios)

- 8 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 7.163 (BT 1.541.10–542.2 Marcovich)

The following books of him (Aristo of Chios) are in circulation:¹

Exhortations, 2 books

On the Tenets of Zeno

*Dialogues*²

Lectures, 6 books

Talks on Wisdom, 7 books

*Talks on Love*³

*Notes on Empty Conceit*⁴

Notes, 25 books

Things to Remember, 3 books

Χρειῶν ια΄,
 Πρὸς τοὺς ῥήτορας,
 Πρὸς τὰς Ἀλεξίνου ἀντιγραφάς,
 Πρὸς τοὺς διαλεκτικοὺς γ΄,
 Πρὸς Κλεάνθην,
 Ἐπιστολῶν δ΄.

15

Παναίτιος δὲ καὶ Σωσικράτης μόνας αὐτοῦ τὰς
 ἐπιστολάς φασι, τὰ δ' ἄλλα τοῦ Περιπατητικοῦ Ἀρίσ-
 τωνος.

1–19 Aristo Chius F 333 SVF = F 12 FSA 7 cf. 10–14; 22; 45–7 11
 cf. 48–9 13 Alexinus F 87 Döring 17–19 Aristo Ceus T 1 Knögel;
 Panaetius F 124 Van Straaten = F 151 Alesse; Sosicrates Rhodius F 12
 Giannattasio Andria II “verba: τὰ δὲ ἄλλα τοῦ Περιπατητικοῦ
 Ἀρίστωνος, si omnino a Panaetio vel Sosicrate profecta sunt, certe non
 referenda sunt ad catalogum qui antecedit. Qui cum scholas, diatribas,
 hypomnemata, apomnemoneumata, chrias contineat, valde accomo-
 datus est ei philosopho, qui scribendo fere abstinere. Nam haec omnia
 ab aliis probabile est litteris mandata esse. Quod fortasse ad dialogos
 quoque referri potest. Scilicet colloquia fuerunt ab ipso Aristone cum
 discipulis habita. Protreptici, de Zenonis placitis liber, cum Alexino et
 dialecticis pugna Stoico tantum Aristoni conveniunt.” Arnim 18
 Περιπατητικοῦ] vid. ad 1.1–2

[vid. ad 1; F² = codicis F corrector] 3–4 unus titulus in B (Περὶ τῶν
 Ζήνωνος δογμάτων διάλογοι; cf. Saal 1852, 14) 9 ὑπομνημάτων BP:
 ὑπομνήματα F 15–16 Πρὸς Κλεάνθην· Ἐπιστολῶν δ' *distinxerunt*
Th. Gomperz, SB Wien 117,10 (1888) 17¹⁴, Arnim, Wehrli; cf. 5.27 et
5.46 17–19 in margine F²

De Aristonis oratione iudicium

9 Cicero, *De finibus* 5.5.13 (BT 13.161.27–162.5 Schiche)

13 simus igitur contenti his. namque horum posterī mel-
 iores illi quidem mea sententia quam reliquarum philo-
 sophi disciplinarum, sed ita degenerant, ut ipsi ex se nati
 esse uideantur. primum Theophrasti, Strato, physicum se
 uoluit; in quo etsi est magnus, tamen noua pleraque et 5
 perpauca de moribus. huius, Lyco, oratione locuples,

Anecdotal Sayings, 11 books
*Against the Orators*⁵
Against the Countercharges of Alexinus
Against the Dialecticians, 3 books
Against Cleanthes
Letters, 4 books.⁶

But Panaetius and Sosicrates say only the letters (are) his (Aristo of Chios) and the other works (are) of the Peripatetic Aristo.⁷

¹ This list of writings is part of the *Life* of Aristo of Chios. There follows the list of homonyms (1) that includes Aristo of Ceos.

² In MS B the title in l. 4 is taken together with that in l. 3 as *one* title: *Dialogues on the doctrines of Zeno*; see, however, Ioppolo 1980, 42–3.

³ This title is sometimes (cp. Wehrli on F 9 p. 50 and Ioppolo 1980, 44–5) connected with the *Erotic Examples*, attributed to Aristo of Ceos (10–14).

⁴ According to Giesecke 1891, 64 κενὴ δόξα is used here in the sense of “vana opinio” rather than of “inanis gloria”; cp. Festa, *FSA* 2.4. This work has been identified by some scholars with the work by the Aristo quoted by Philodemus in Book 10 of *On Vices* (21); see Ioppolo 1980, 45–7 and 21a n. 1.

⁵ The Greek word *rhêtôr* often refers to a political orator; cp. 32–3. On this work, see Ioppolo 1980, 48–50; 53; 190⁷.

⁶ The title in l. 16 is sometimes taken together with that in l. 15 as *one* title: *Letters to Cleanthes*, 4 books; see Ioppolo 1980, 50.

⁷ On this list of writings, see Arnim on Aristo of Chios F 333 *SVF* 1.75–6 and Festa, *FSA* 2.2–4; Wehrli on Aristo of Ceos F 9 p. 50–1 and *RE* Suppl. 11 (1968) 157; Tsekourakis 1980, 239–41; Caujolle-Goulet, *DPhA* 1 (1989) 398–9; Guérard *ibidem* 403; Ioppolo 1980, 39–55. On Diogenes’ statement about Panaetius and Sosicrates, see also Alesse on Panaetius F 151 p. 291–4; Giannatasio Andria on Sosicrates F 12 p. 104. See also Hahm in this volume.

Judgment on Aristo’s Style of Writing

9 Cicero, *On Ends* 5.5.13 (BT 13.161.27–162.5 Schiche)

- 13 Let us, therefore, content ourselves with these men.¹ For their successors are indeed in my opinion better than the philosophers of the remaining schools, yet they have degenerated to such a degree that they might seem to have been born out of themselves. To begin with, (the successor) of Theophrastus, Strato, wished to be a natural philosopher; but great as he is in this department, yet most (of what he says) is new-fangled and (there is) very little on ethics. His

- 10 W rebus ipsis ieiunior. concinnus deinde et elegans huius, Aristo, sed ea quae desideratur a magno philosopho grauitas in eo non fuit; scripta sane et multa et polita, sed nescio quo pacto auctoritatem oratio non habet. 10

1–10 *Lyco 11 SFOD; Arist. T 76b Düring p. 427* 1–7 *Strato F 12 Wehrli; Thphr. 18 no. 19 FHS&G* 6–7 *Lyco F 17 Wehrli* 7–10 *Aristo Ceus T 7 Knögel* 7–8 huius, Aristo] *vid. ad 4A.3–4* 10 sed nescio—non habet] *cf. 18.3–4*

[BERNV] 6 lyco V: lico R: lisias et N² (“*versu ultra marginem continuato; ex priore scriptura lic cognosci posse videtur*”); *om. BE spatium vacuo relicto* 7 ipsi rebus R

Erotica Homoia [Ἐρωτικὰ ὅμοια 10–14]

vide etiam Plutarchum, *Amatorius* 21 766D–F = 22

- 10 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 15.16 674B–C (BT 3.489.21–490.8 Kaibel)

- 22 W 16 Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἐρωτικῶν καὶ Ἀρίστων ὁ Περιπατητικός, Κεῖος δὲ τὸ γένος, ἐν β' Ἐρωτικῶν Ὁμοίων φασὶν ὅτι οἱ ἀρχαῖοι διὰ τοὺς περὶ τὸν οἶνον πόνους τῶν κεφαλαλγιῶν δεσμοὺς εὕρισκον τοὺς τυχόντας, τῆς τῶν κροτάφων συνδέσεως ὠφελεῖν 5 δοκούσης· οἱ δ' ὕστερον ἅμα τῷ κροτάφῳ προσέβαλόν τινα καὶ κόσμον οἰκεῖον τῇ παρὰ τὸν οἶνον διαγωγῇ, C μηχανησάμενοι τὸν στέφανον. βέλτιον δὲ διὰ τὸ πάσας τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ εἶναι ταύτην στεφανοῦσθαι ἢ διὰ τὸ συμφέρειν ἐσκεπάσθαι καὶ συνδεδέ- 10 σθαι τοὺς κροτάφους πρὸς τὸν οἶνον. ἐστεφανοῦντο δὲ καὶ τὸ μέτωπον, ὡς ὁ καλὸς Ἀνακρέων ἔφη· . . .

1–12 *Ath. Epit. 2.2.150.23–30 Peppink* 1–11 *Aristo Ceus F 9 Knögel; Arist. F 41 Gigon = F 95 Rose (cf. 13A.29)* 2 ὁ Περιπατητικός] *vid. ad 1.1–2* || Κεῖος] *vid. ad 3.8* 3–11 *cf. 17 675C–E et Plu., Quaest. conv. 3.1 645D–648A* 12 *Anacreon F 410 PMG*

[*A et EC = Epit.*] 1–3 Ἀριστοτέλης—φασὶν] Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ ὁ Κίος φησιν *EC* 3 ὁμοίως *A, corr. Casaubon* 5 ὠφελεῖν *EC*: ὀφελεῖν *A* 7 παρὰ] περὶ *EC*

(successor), Lyco, was rich in style, but rather poor in the (subject)matter itself. Next, his (successor), Aristo, was polished and elegant, but that gravity which one desires in a great philosopher was lacking in him; he wrote much, it is true, and well-finished at that, but his style somehow does not have authority.²

¹ M. Pupius Piso is discussing happiness from a Peripatetic point of view. After some preliminaries (9–11), he discusses the relative positions of Aristotle and Theophrastus (12), and decides to make these two his authorities; then he turns to their followers whom he describes as “degenerate” (13–14).

² On the use of the terms *concinnus*, *elegans*, and *gravitas*, see Wehrli on Aristo of Ceos F 10 p. 51 and Knögel 1933, 48–9.

Erotic Examples [*Erotic Examples* 10–14]

see also Plutarch, *Dialogue on Love* 21 766D–F = 22

10 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 15.16 674B–C (BT 3.489.21–490.8 Kaibel)

16 Aristotle, in the second (book) of his *Erotica*, and Aristo the Peripatetic, from Ceos by birth, in the second (book) of *Erotic Examples*,¹ say that the men of ancient times, because of the headaches under which they labored as a result of (drinking) wine, devised whatever bandages they could find, since the tight binding of the temples was thought to bring relief; but that the men of later times, in conjunction with the temple(bandage), also added an adornment peculiar to the passing of the time in drinking wine, by contriving the wreath. And (they say) it (is) better, because all one’s sensations are in one’s head, to put a wreath around that, than, because of the relief it brings, to have one’s temples covered and tightly bound against the wine.² They wreathed their forehead too, as noble Anacreon said: . . .

¹ On the title *Erotic Examples*, see Wehrli on F 22 p. 63 and *RE* Suppl. 11 (1968) 158; Knögel 1933, 83–4.

² In § 8 (669C) slaves bring in wreaths and perfumes for the guests at the banquet. This triggers a discussion of wreaths. The passage quoted is part of a learned discussion by the philosopher Democritus of Nicomedia. For “the use of garlands to bind the temples in cases of headaches with tension in the veins that are caused by drunkenness,” see Corvisier 2000, 497–8.

- 11 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 10.14 419A–D (BT 2.411.24–5; 412.2; 5; 10–22 Kaibel)

14 τῶν δειπνῶν δὲ πολλοὶ τὰ μέτρια ἀσπάζονται, ὥς
 B Ἀλεξίς ἐν Φιλούσῃ παραδίδωσιν· . . . Ψευδομένῳ· . . .
 24 W C ἐν δὲ Συντρόφοις· . . . Ἀρίστων δ' ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐν
 Ἑρωτικῶν Ὀμοίων δευτέρῳ Πολέμωνά φησι τὸν Ἀκα-
 δημαϊκὸν παραινεῖν τοῖς ἐπὶ δειπνον πορευομένοις 5
 φροντίζειν ὅπως ἡδὺν πότον ποιῶνται μὴ μόνον
 εἰς τὸ παρόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὴν αὔριον. Τιμόθεος δ' ὁ
 Κόνωνος ἐκ τῶν πολυτελῶν καὶ στρατηγικῶν δειπνῶν
 παραληφθεὶς ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος εἰς τὸ ἐν Ἀκαδημαίᾳ συμ-
 D πόσιον καὶ ἐστιαθεὶς ἀφελῶς καὶ μουσικῶς ἔφη ὥς οἱ 10
 παρὰ Πλάτῳ δειπνοῦντες καὶ τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ καλῶς
 γίνονται. ὁ δ' Ἡγήσανδρος ἐν τοῖς Ὑπομνήμασιν ἔφη ὥς
 καὶ τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ ὁ Τιμόθεος ἀπαντήσας τῷ Πλάτῳ
 νι εἶπεν· “ὕμεις, ὦ Πλάτων, εὖ δειπνεῖτε μᾶλλον εἰς τὴν
 ὑστεραίαν ἢ τὴν παροῦσαν ἡμέραν.” 15

2–3 Alexis F 256; 261; 219 PCG II 3–15 Ath. Epit. 2.2.27.30–8
 Peppink 3–7 Aristo Ceus F 10 Knögel; Polemo F 51 Gigante 3
 Ἀρίστων ὁ φιλόσοφος] cf. 14B.10; 34; 41.1 et 17A.14 6 ἡδὺν
 πότον] cf. 12.1 7–15 Hegesand. F 34 FHG IV; cf. Ael., VH 2.18 et
 13A.15–19 7–12 cf. Cic., Tusc. 5.35.100; Plu., De tuenda san. 9 127A;
 Quaest. conv. 6.1 686A–B

[A et EC = Epit.] 3–5 Ἀρίστων—παραινεῖν] Πολέμων δὲ ὁ Ἀκα-
 δημαϊκὸς παρήνει EC 12–14 ὁ δ' Ἡγήσανδρος—εἶπεν] καὶ Πλά-
 τῳ δὲ τηνικαῦτα ἀπαντήσας, ὥς φησιν Ἡγήσανδρος, εἶπεν EC

- 12 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 2.8 38F–39A (BT 1.90.3–9 Kaibel)

23 W 8 καλῶς οὖν Ἀρίστων ὁ Κεῖός φησιν ἡδιστον ποτὸν
 εἶναι τὸν ἅμα μὲν γλυκύτητος, ἅμα δ' εὐωδίας κοινω-
 νοῦντα. διὸ καὶ τὸ καλούμενον νέκταρ κατασκευάζειν
 τινὰς περὶ τὸν Λυδίας Ὀλυμπον οἶνον καὶ κηρία συγ-
 39A κιννάβτας εἰς ταῦτά καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀνθῶν εὐώδη. οἶδα δ' 5
 ὅτι Ἀναξανδρίδης τὸ νέκταρ οὐ ποτόν, ἀλλὰ τροφήν

- 11 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 10.14 419A–D (BT 2.411.24–5; 412.2; 5; 10–22 Kaibel)

14 As for dinners, many people welcome moderate bills of fare, as B Alexis transmits in *The Girl in Love*: . . . In *The Deceiver*: . . . And C in *Foster Brothers*: . . .¹ The philosopher Aristo, in the second (book) of *Erotic Examples*, says that Polemon the Academic² advised all who go out to dinner to consider how to make their drinking pleasant not only for the present moment, but also for the morning after. When Timotheus, the son of Conon,³ was taken D along by Plato, as a change from the expensive and five-star⁴ dinners (he usually attended), to the banquet in the Academy and was entertained there in a simple and cultivated manner, he said that people who dine at Plato's feel alright even the next day. Hegesander in his *Memoirs* said that Timotheus ran into Plato the next day too and remarked: "You (and your friends), Plato, dine well with a view rather to the day after than for the present day."⁵

¹ At the beginning of Book 10 Athenaeus starts a theme which naturally follows after the preceding discussions: gluttony. § 14 opens with three quotations from the comic poet Alexis to make the point that, as in everything else, excess in eating is bad: it does not bring any more pleasure, only more expense.

² Ca. 350–276/5. Successor of Xenocrates as scholarch (D.L. 4.16–20).

³ Prominent Athenian statesman and general (*strategos*) in the first half of the fourth century B.C.

⁴ Literally "as are given to generals (*strategoí*)"; see n. 3.

⁵ For the anecdote about Timotheus and Plato, see Riginos, *Platonica*, 123–4 (no. 78).

- 12 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 2.8 38F–39A (BT 1.90.3–9 Kaibel)

8 Rightly, then,¹ Aristo of Ceos says that the most pleasant drink is the one that has a share at once of sweetness and of bouquet. That is in fact why (he says) that certain people around the Lydian Olympus prepare the so-called *nectar* by mixing wine and honey 39A together with the fragrances of flowers. I know that Anaxandrides²

εἶναι λέγει θεῶν . . .

1–5 *Aristo Ceus F II Knögel* 1 ὁ Κεῖος] *vid. ad 3.8* || ἡδιστον ποτὸν] *cf. 11.6* 3 νέκταρ] *cf. 1.58 32B* 6 *Anaxandrides F 58 PCG II*

[*EC = Ath. Epit.*] 1 Κῖος *EC* 2 γλυκυτάτῳ *EC, corr. Musurus* || εὐδίας *EC, corr. Villebrun* 5 καὶ τῶν ἀνθῶν τὰ *Wilamowitz*

13A *Athenaeus, Deipnosophistae* 13.15–16 563E–564B (BT 3. 242.14–243.20 Kaibel)

- παιδοπίπαι ὄντες καὶ τοῦτο μόνον ἐξηλωκότες τὸν ἀρχηγὸν ὑμῶν τῆς σοφίας Ζήνωνα τὸν Φοίνικα, ὃς οὐδέποτε γυναικὶ ἐχρήσατο, παιδικοῖς δ' αἰεὶ, ὥς Ἀντίγονος ὁ Καρύστιος ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ βίου αὐτοῦ. 5
 18 W F θρυλεῖτε γὰρ ὅτι δεῖ μὴ τῶν σωμάτων ἀλλὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐρᾶν· οἵτινες μέχρι ὀκτὼ καὶ εἴκοσι ἐτῶν δεῖν λέγοντες 5
 συνέχουν τοὺς ἐρωμένους. —καὶ μοι δοκεῖ Ἀρίστων ὁ Κεῖος ὁ Περιπατητικὸς οὐ κακῶς εἰρηκέναι ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ περὶ τῶν Ἐρωτικῶν Ὁμοίων πρὸς τινὰ Ἀττικόν, μέγαν τινὰ κατὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν ἐπιδεικνύντα 10
 ὥς καλόν, ᾧ Δῶρος ἦν ὄνομα· “τὴν πρὸς Δόλωνα μοι,” φησί, “δοκῶ παρ' Ὀδυσσέως ἀπάντησιν ἐπὶ σὲ μεταφέρειν·
 “ἦ ῥά νύ τοι μεγάλων Δώρων ἐπεμαίετο θυμός.””
 16 Ἠγήσανδρος δ' ἐν τοῖς Ὑπομνήμασι τῶν ἡδυσμάτων φησὶν ἐρᾶν πάντα, οὐ τῶν κρεῶν οὐδὲ τῶν 15
 ἰχθύων· ἀπογενομένων γοῦν τούτων οὐδεὶς ἡδέως ἔτι προσφέρεται τὸ κρέας οὐδὲ τὸν ἰχθύν οὐδ' ἐπιθυμεῖ τῶν ὠμῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνηδύντων.
 17 W καὶ γὰρ τὸ παλαιὸν παίδων ἥρων, ὥς καὶ ὁ Ἀρίστων ἔφη, ὅθεν καὶ καλεῖσθαι τοὺς ἐρωμένους συνέβη 20
 παιδικά. πρὸς ἀλήθειαν γάρ, καθάπερ φησὶ Κλέαρχος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Ἐρωτικῶν, Λυκοφρονίδην εἰρηκέναι φησίν·
 B “οὔτε παιδὸς ἄρρενος οὔτε παρθένων 25

says that *nectar* is not drink, but food for the gods: . . .

¹ The part of the *Venetus Marcianus* 447 (A) containing Books 1 and 2 of the *Sophists at Dinner* has been lost. Parts of these books have been preserved in the Epitome (EC); see Arnott 2000, 42–50. Whenever the epitomator includes Aristo in his excerpt, he omits the title of the work; see the *apparatus criticus* of 10.1–3, 11.3–5, 13A.7–9. The epitomized nature of the text makes it difficult to place the passage (note the “then”) in its context: in § 7 Philochorus (328 F 5b FGrH = Ath. 2.7 38C–D) is quoted as saying that Amphictyon, king of Athens, was the first to *mix* wine, having learned it from Dionysus.

² A comic poet of the fourth century B.C.

13A Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 13.15–16 563E–564B (BT 3.242.14–243.20 Kaibel)

Oglers of boys you are,¹ and in that alone you emulate the founder of your wisdom, Zeno the Phoenician,² who never had dealings with a woman at all, but always with boyfriends, as Antigonos of Carystus reports in his work on his life. For you are always going on about the fact that one should covet not the bodies but the soul; people like you, who say(ing) that up to (the age of) F twenty-eight years one should keep lovers. — ³And it seems to me that it was not a bad remark that Aristo of Ceos, the Peripatetic, has made in the second (book) on the *Erotic Examples* to someone from Attica, who singled out a certain person named Dorus, large for his age, for his good looks: “I think,” he (Aristo) says,⁴ “I’ll take the rejoinder which Odysseus made to Dolon and apply it to you:

‘Surely now thy heart was eager for large Rewards’.”⁵

16 Hegesander in his *Memoirs* says that all people love the seasoning, not the meat or the fish; it is at any rate true that, if that is taken away, no one any longer has pleasure in taking meat or fish, nor does anyone relish raw and unseasoned (food).

As a matter of fact in ancient times too they loved boys [*paidôn*], as also Aristo said,⁶ whence it has come about that those who are loved are called “boyfriends” [*paidika*]. For it is in accordance with truth, as Clearchus says in the first (book) of his *Erotica*, what he says Lycophronides has said:⁷

B “Neither in a male boy, nor in maidens,

τῶν χρυσοφόρων οὐδὲ γυναικῶν βαθυκόλπων
καλὸν τὸ πρόσωπον, ἀλλ' ὃ κόσμιον πεφύκει.
ἡ γὰρ αἰδὼς ἄνθος ἐπισπείρει.”
καὶ ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἔφη τοὺς ἐραστὰς εἰς οὐδὲν ἄλλο
τοῦ σώματος τῶν ἐρωμένων ἀποβλέπειν ἢ τοὺς ὀφθαλ- 30
μούς, ἐν οἷς τὴν αἰδῶ κατοικεῖν.

1–7 Zeno F 247 SVF 1–4 *Antigon. F 33A Dorandi* 2–4 *Antigon. p. 117 Wilamowitz* 2–3 Ζήνωνα—παιδικοῖς δ' αἰεῖ] cf. *D.L. 7.13 (= Antigon. F 33B Dorandi; p. 117 Wilamowitz)* 7–14 *Ath. Epit. 2.2.104.35–7 Peppink; Aristo Ceus F 8 Knögel; vid. 13B* 8 ὁ Κεῖος] *vid. ad 3.8* || ὁ Περιπατητικὸς] *vid. ad 1.1–2* 14 *Hom., Il. 10. 401 15–19 et 29–31 Ath. Epit. 2.2.104.38–105.4 Peppink, omissis* 20–8 15–19 *Hegesand. F 26 FHG IV; cf. 11.7–15; “haec Aristonis potius verba ab Hegesandro citata” Kaibel* 20–8 *Clearch. F 22 Wehrli; Lycophron. 843 PMG* 20–2 *Aristo Ceus F 12 Knögel* 29–31 *Arist. F 43 Gigon = F 96 Rose; cf. 10.1*

[*A et EC = Epit.*] 5 θρυλεῖται *A: corr. Musurus* 7–9 καί μοι δοκεῖ—πρὸς τινα] Ἀρίστων ὁ Κεῖος πρὸς τινα *EC* 8 Κεῖος *i supra-scripto C: Κῖος AE: corr. Musurus* 10 “Ἀττικόν suspectum, fort. ἐρωτικόν *vel* στωικόν” *Kaibel* 11–13 τὴν πρὸς—μεταφέρειν] τὸ Ὀδυσσέως ἔφη πρὸς Δόλωνα· *EC* 12 ἐπὶ σὲ *Musurus: ἔπεισι A* 15–16 Ἠγήσανδρος—πάντας] φησὶν Ἠγήσανδρος τῶν ἡδυσμάτων ἐρᾶν πάντως *EC* 17 γοῦν] οὖν *EC* 20–1 Ἀρίστων *Meineke: Ἀριστοφῶν A* 24 φησὶν *del. Meineke* 27 ἀλλ' ὁ *Page: ἀλλὰ A: ἐὰν μὴ Meineke* || πεφύκει *A: πεφύκη Meineke: πέφυκεν Schaefer* 30 τῶν ἐρωμένων *om. EC*

*13B Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* 20.407 (4.428. 17–429.4 Van der Valk)

ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι δῶρον κοινῶς μὲν τὸ διδόμενον, ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ κύριον ὄνομα, καὶ οὐ μόνον παλαιόν, ἐξ οὗ καὶ οἱ Δωριεῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῖς ὑστερογενής. ἐφ' ᾧ νέφ τε ὄντι καὶ μεγάλῳ καὶ καλῷ καὶ ἐπιδεικνυμένῳ πρὸς τι- 5
νος ἐπὶ θαύματι ἐν Ἀθηναῖς Ἀρίστων ὁ Κεῖος ἔφη τὸ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως πρὸς Δόλωνα “ἡ ῥά νῦν τοι μεγάλων Δώρων ἐπεμαίετο θυμός,” ἡγουν ἀγαπᾷς τὸν μέγαν Δῶρον, μεταλαβὼν ἀστεῖως ἐκεῖνος τὴν γενικὴν τῶν πλη-

those adorned with gold,⁸ nor in deep-bosomed women
(is) the countenance fair unless it is decorous by nature.

For it is modesty that sows the bloom (of beauty) on it.”

Aristotle too said that lovers look to no other part of the body of their beloved than the eyes, in which dwells modesty.

¹ The subject under discussion is love and beauty. In § 12 the philosopher Pontianus expounds the theory of love of the Stoic Zeno, that “Eros is a god who brings about friendship and concord and even liberty, but nothing else.” In §§ 13–14 the grammarian Plutarch introduces the issue of love for boys, who surely are loved not for their character only, but also for their good looks. In § 15 the grammarian Myrtilus launches an attack on the Stoics. He first quotes the iambic poet Hermias (p. 237 CA Powell) to lay bare the hypocrisy in sexual matters of the Stoics, whose practice is very different from what they preach.

² Zeno’s home town Citium was in Cyprus.

³ The attack on the Stoics appears to be interrupted here to be continued in § 18 564F.

⁴ According to Wehrli on F 18 p. 63, in the process of copying this anecdote from Aristo’s work, the rejoinder made by an unknown person to the Athenian was telescoped into a saying of Aristo himself.

⁵ Dolon, caught by Diomedes and Odysseus, is begging for his life: “Hector had promised him the horses and chariot of Achilles, if he would go and reconnoitre the situation in the Greek camp.” For the pun, see **13B** with n. 1.

⁶ The name Aristo is a correction by Meineke of the name Aristopho of the MS. If Aristo is read, it almost certainly refers to Aristo of Ceos who has been quoted shortly before in § 15 (ll. 7–8). The confusion with Aristopho may be due to the fact that the comic poet Aristopho is also quoted in § 15 (F 11 PCG IV).

⁷ Lyric poet of unknown date. He is quoted by Athenaeus here and in 15.9 670E–F, from the first book of Clearchus’ *Erotica* (F 22 & 24 Wehrli).

⁸ Literally “gold-bearing”; in 13.90 609F a beauty contest is mentioned, where the women who participate in the contest are called *chrysophoroi*.

***13B** Eustathius, *Commentary on Homer’s Iliad* 20.407 (4.428.17–429.4 Van der Valk)

It is to be noted that *dôron* in the ordinary sense (is) “what is being given,” but that it is also a proper name, and that not only long ago—in fact the (name) *Dorians* (derives) from it—but also (of) a person of later times. With reference to this person—he was young, large and handsome—, when he was being pointed out by someone for admiration in Athens, Aristo of Ceos quoted Odysseus’ words to Dolon, “Surely now thy heart was eager for large Rewards,” that is to say, you fancy large Doros. He (Aristo)

θυντικῶν εἰς αἰτιατικὴν ἐνικὴν, ἥς ἡ εὐθεῖα ὁ μέγας
Δῶρος, οὗ κλητικὴ “ὦ μέγαλε” παρ’ Αἰσχύλῳ, ὡς τὸ “ὦ 10
μέγαλε Ζεῦ.”

1–11 *additamentum, quod Eustathius ipse in codice Laurentiano adiecit* 8–11 *explicatio μεταλαβὼν—Ζεῦ postea ab Eustathio est adiecta*
10–11 *A. Th. 822.*

14A Plutarchus, *Aristides* 2.2–6 (BT 1.1.251.9–252.10 Ziegler)

2 ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν φασι παῖδας ὄντας αὐτοὺς καὶ συν-
τρεφομένους ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἐν παντὶ καὶ σπουδῆς ἐχομένῳ
καὶ παιδιᾷ πράγματι καὶ λόγῳ διαφέρεσθαι πρὸς ἀλ-
λήλους, καὶ τὰς φύσεις εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τῆς φιλονικίας
ἐκείνης ἀνακαλύπτεσθαι, [καὶ] τὴν μὲν εὐχερῇ καὶ 5
παράβολον καὶ πανοῦργον οὖσαν καὶ μετ’ ὀξύτητος
ἐπὶ πάντα ῥαδίως φερομένην, τὴν δ’ ἰδρυμένην ἐν ᾗθει
βεβαίῳ καὶ πρὸς τὸ δίκαιον ἀτενῇ, ψεῦδος δὲ καὶ βωμ-
ολοχίαν καὶ ἀπάτην οὐδ’ ἐν παιδιᾷ τινι τρόπῳ προσ-
20 W 3 ιεμένην. Ἀρίστων δ’ ὁ Κεῖος ἐξ ἐρωτικῆς ἀρχῆς γενέ- 10
σθαι φησὶ καὶ προελθεῖν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον τὴν ἔχθραν αὐ-
4 τῶν. Στησίλεω γάρ, ὃς ἦν γένει Κεῖος, ιδέα τε καὶ μορ-
φῇ σώματος πολὺ τῶν ἐν ὥρᾳ λαμπρότατος, ἀμφοτέρ-
ους ἐρασθέντας οὐ μετρίως ἐνεγκεῖν τὸ πάθος, οὐδ’ ἅμα
λήγοντι τῷ κάλλει τοῦ παιδὸς ἀποθέσθαι τὴν φιλο- 15
νικίαν, ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ ἐγγυμνασασμένους ἐκείνῃ πρὸς
τὴν πολιτείαν εὐθὺς ὀρμῆσαι, διαπύρους ὄντας καὶ
5 διαφόρως ἔχοντας. ὁ μὲν οὖν Θεμιστοκλῆς εἰς ἐταιρεί-
αν ἐμβαλὼν ἑαυτὸν εἶχε πρόβλημα καὶ δύναμιν οὐκ
εὐκαταφρόνητον, ὥστε καὶ πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα καλῶς 20
ἄρξιν αὐτὸν Ἀθηναίων, ἅνπερ ἴσος ἦ καὶ κοινὸς
ἅπασι, “μηδέποτε” εἰπεῖν “εἰς τοῦτον ἐγὼ καθίσαιμι τὸν
θρόνον ἐν ᾧ πλέον οὐδὲν ἔξουσιν οἱ φίλοι παρ’
6 ἐμοὶ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων”· Ἀριστείδης δὲ καθ’ αὐτὸν ὥσ- 25
περ ὁδὸν ἰδίαν ἐβάδιζε διὰ τῆς πολιτείας, πρῶτον μὲν
οὐ βουλόμενος συναδικεῖν τοῖς ἐταίροις ἢ λυπηρὸς
εἶναι μὴ χαριζόμενος, ἔπειτα τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν φίλων δύνα-

elegantly made the genitive of the plural have the reference of an accusative singular, of which the nominative (is) large Doros, of which the vocative “O large” (occurs) in Aeschylus, as “O large (i.e., great) Zeus.”¹

¹ In the Homeric passage a neuter genitive plural “large rewards” [*megalôn dôrôn*] is governed by the verb “to be eager for.” Aristo takes this in the sense of an accusative singular [*megan Dôron*] of a proper name, “large Doros.” The nominative of this proper name is *megas Dôros* “large Doros” and the vocative is *megale*.

14APlutarch, *Aristides* 2.2–6 (BT 1.1.251.9–252.10 Ziegler)

2 Now some people say that they (Themistocles and Aristides),
when they were boys and were being brought up together, from the
outset vied with one another in every action and word, whether in
earnest or for play, and that from this rivalry their natures were
straightway revealed. The (nature of Themistocles was shown) to
be cool, daring, and unscrupulous, easily carried away into (under-
taking) with keen zest anything at all, while that (of Aristides was
shown) to be founded on a firm character, unbendingly intent on
what is right, and not admitting falsehood, buffoonery, or deceit,
3 even in any kind of playful sport whatever. But Aristo of Ceos¹
says that it was from an erotic source that their enmity originated
4 and grew to such a pitch. For (according to Aristo) both fell in love
with Stesilaus, who was a Cean by birth, in both bodily shape and
build by far the most splendid of those who were in the bloom of
youth; they did not endure their passion with moderation and did
not even put away their rivalry by the time the beauty of the boy
started to fade, but, having as it were (thus) received their training
in that (erotic rivalry), straightway moved into the political arena,
5 being as alike in fieriness as they were different in all else.² In any
case, Themistocles, on the one hand, embarked upon (a course of)
political affiliation and (thus) had a protection and an influence that
was not easy to despise. Hence he actually said to the person who
told him that he would be a fine ruler over the Athenians provided
he would be fair and impartial to all: “Never may I take a seat on
that bench where my friends are to have no more influence with me
6 than strangers.” Aristides, on the other hand, went on his own,
(treading) as it were his own private path through political life, in

μιν οὐκ ὀλίγους ὁρῶν ἐπαίρουσαν ἀδικεῖν, ἐφυλάττετο, μόνῳ τῷ χρηστᾷ καὶ δίκαια πράττειν καὶ λέγειν ἀξιῶν θαρρεῖν τὸν ἀγαθὸν πολίτην.

30

1–10 cf. *Ael.*, *VH* 13.44 10–30 *Aristo Ceus F* 13 *Knögel* 10–18 cf. **14B** 10 ὁ Κεῖος] *vid. ad* **3.8** 12 Στησίλεω] *RE* III A 2 (1929) 2463 [2] 20–4 *Plu.*, *Praec. ger. rep.* 13 807A–B [= *Mor.*] = *Ps.-Max.* 9.–/ 23 p. 218 *Ihm et Anton.* 2.1 1005A 24–30 cf. *Plu.*, *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 186A

[*S*(*UA*=)*Y*] 1 οὖν *om.* *Y* 2 ἐχομένους *Y* 3 παιδείας *Y* 4 ἀπὸ *S*: ὑπὸ *Y* 5 καὶ *del. Schaefer* 7 πάντας *Y* 8 ἀτενεῖ *Classen* 10 Κεῖος *Y*: Χῖος *S* 11 προσελθεῖν *S*¹ 12 τε *S*: *om.* *Y*: δὲ *Sintenis* 17–18 καὶ διαφόρως ἔχοντας *om.* *S* 22 εἶπεν *Y* 22–3 τοῦτον . . . τὸν θρόνον] τοιοῦτον . . . θρόνον *Mor.*, *Ps.-Max.*, *Anton.* 23 οὐδὲν] οὐχ *Mor.*, *Ps.-Max.*, *Anton.* 24 τῶν ἀλλοτρίων] τῶν μὴ φίλων *Mor. et Ps.-Max.*, *Anton.*, *qui post* τῶν μὴ φίλων *addunt* οὐ γὰρ ἀφίλων αἱ πόλεις ἀνδρῶν καὶ ἀνεταίρων, ἀλλὰ χρηστῶν καὶ σωφρόνων δέονται *ex Plu.*, *Praec. ger. rep.* 13 807A 28 ὁρῶν *Y*: ἰδὼν *S* 29 μόνῳ τῷ χρηστᾷ *Y*: οὐ μόνῳ τῷ χρῆσθαι *S*: τῷ (τὰ) *Ziegler* 30 θαρρεῖν *S*: χαίρειν *Y*

14B Plutarchus, *Themistocles* 3.1–2 (BT 1.1.159.25–160.7 Ziegler)

1 ταχὺ μέντοι καὶ νεανικῶς ἔοικεν ἄσπασθαι τοῦ
Θεμιστοκλέους τὰ πολιτικὰ πράγματα καὶ σφόδρα ἢ
πρὸς δόξαν ὁρμὴ κρατῆσαι. δι' ἣν εὐθύς ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοῦ
πρωτεύειν ἐφιέμενος, ἰταμῶς ὑφίστατο τὰς πρὸς τοὺς
δυναμένους ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ πρωτεύοντας ἀπεχθείας, 5
μάλιστα δ' Ἀριστείδην τὸν Λυσιμάχου, τὴν ἐναντίαν
19 W 2 αἰεὶ πορευόμενον αὐτῷ. καίτοι δοκεῖ παντάπασιν ἢ
πρὸς τοῦτον ἔχθρα μειρακιώδη λαβεῖν ἀρχήν· ἡράσ-
θησαν γὰρ ἀμφοτέρω τοῦ καλοῦ Στησίλεω, Κεῖου τὸ
γένος ὄντος, ὡς Ἀρίστων ὁ φιλόσοφος ἰστόρηκεν. ἐκ 10
δὲ τούτου διετέλουν καὶ περὶ τὰ δημόσια στασιάζοντες.

1–11 cf. **14A** 7–10 *Aristo Ceus F* 14 *Knögel* 10 Ἀρίστων ὁ φιλόσοφος] *vid. ad* **11.3**

[*S*(*UMA*=) *Y*] 3 τοῦ *om.* *Y* 4 τὰς *om.* *S* 6 τὸν *Y*: τοῦ *S* 7 πορευόμενος *Anonymus* 9 καλοῦ *Y*: κάλλους *S*|| Κεῖου *editores ex 14A.12*: τείου *Y*: τίου *S*

the first place, because he did not want to join his political affiliates in wrong-doing or be a cause of vexation (to them) by not giving in to their wishes; furthermore, seeing that the power derived from their friends incited not a few to do wrong, he was on his guard (against that), deeming it right that a good citizen should put his trust only in doing and speaking what is useful and just.³

¹ The MSS vary between *Cean* and *Chian* here, but the fact that the story involves a native of Ceos, Stesilaus, supports that Aristo of Ceos is meant.

² The end of the indirect speech shows that the quotation of Aristo of Ceos ends here. Cp. n. 3.

³ Knögel expands F 13 of Aristo of Ceos so as to include ll. 18–30. One of his reasons is that a saying of Themistocles is quoted in lines 22–4 which is also quoted in Plutarch's *Precepts of Statecraft* 13 807A–B, where another saying of an unspecified Aristo is quoted in 10 804D–E (27). Both sayings are attributed to Aristo of Ceos by Knögel; see Knögel on F 13 p. 84–5, and 27 n. 1.

14B Plutarch, *Themistocles* 3.1–2 (BT 1.1.159.25–160.7 Ziegler)

- 1 Quickly, however,¹ and vigorously (as happens at a youthful age) political affairs appear to have taken hold of Themistocles and strongly, too, the urge to win a reputation (appears) to have gained control (over him). For this reason, straightway from the outset, in his desire to play a leading role, he boldly stood up to the enmities of men who had power in the city and played a leading role, especially Aristides the son of Lysimachus, who always followed a
- 2 course opposed to his. And yet his enmity with this man appears to have had an altogether puerile source. The fact is that they had both fallen in love with the beautiful Stesilaus, who was a Cean by birth,² as Aristo the philosopher has reported. And from that moment they continued to be rivals even in the public domain.³

¹ At the end of the preceding chapter Plutarch tells the story of how Themistocles' father tried to frighten him off from entering politics by taking the young Themistocles to the beach and pointing out some old triremes lying abandoned and discarded (the fate of the old "discarded" politician).

² The MSS read "of Teos," clearly a mistake for "of Ceos"; cp. 14A.

³ This version appears to be a shortened version of the one in the *Life of Aristides* (14A).

Lyc0 [Λύκων 15]

- 15 Plutarchus, *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat* 1 14E
(BT 1.28.4–11 Paton et al.)

33 W ὅτι δὲ τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ λεγομένων οἱ σφόδρα νέοι
τοῖς μὴ δοκοῦσι φιλοσόφως μὴδ' ἀπὸ σπουδῆς λέγεσθαι
χαίρουσι μᾶλλον καὶ παρέχουσιν ὑπηκόους ἑαυτοὺς καὶ
χειροήθεις, δῆλόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν. οὐ γὰρ μόνον τὰ Αἰσώπεια 5
μυθάρια καὶ τὰς ποιητικὰς ὑποθέσεις καὶ τὸν Ἄβαριν
τὸν Ἡρακλείδου καὶ τὸν Λύκωνα τὸν Ἀρίστωνος
διερχόμενοι, (ἀλλὰ καὶ) τὰ περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν δόγματα
μεμειγμένα μυθολογία μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἐνθουσιῶσι.

1–8 Aristo Ceus T 5 Knögel; Lyc0 23 SFOD; Heracl. Pont. F 73 Wehrli
5 τὸν Ἄβαριν] vid. Wehrli ad F 73–5 Heracl. Pont. p. 84–6; DNP 1
(1996) 5–6 s.v. Abaris

[GXvZ(V)WCY(J)p(q)Mα(t)ANhSD; Crönert = emendationes ex eius
Moralium exemplo nunc Gottingae in philologorum seminario adser-
vato depromptae; vid. BT 1.355 et 366] 5 (ἀλλὰ) post ὑποθέσεις ma-
nus posterior in α, Crönert, Wehrli 7 ἀλλὰ καὶ inserunt G²X³V
(“hiatus pausa excusandus”): (καὶ) τὰ (ἄλλα) Crönert

Vitae Philosophorum

vide etiam Diogenem Laertium, *Vitae Philosophorum* 9.5
= 23; 9.11–12 = 24A; 2.22 = 24B; 10.13–14 = 25.

de Aristone vitarum philosophorum auctore vide P.
Moraux, *Les Listes anciennes des Ouvrages d'Aristote*,
Louvain 1951, 243–7; “Diogène Laërce et le *Peripatos*,”
Elenchos 7 (1986) 249–52; S. N. Mouraviev, “La Vie
d'Héraclite de Diogène Laërce. Analyse stratigraphique—
Le texte de base—Un nouveau fragment d'Ariston de
Céos?,” *Phronesis* 32 (1987) 1–33; M. Gigante, “Aristone
di Ceo biografo dei filosofi,” *Studi Classici e Orientali* 46,1
1996 (1998) 17–23.

Lyco [*Lyco* 15]

- 15 Plutarch, *How a Young Man Ought to Study Poetry* 1 14E (BT 1. 28.4–11 Paton *et al.*)

But¹ it is clear to us that the very young get more enjoyment out of those philosophical discourses that do not seem to be stated in a philosophical, or even a serious manner, and that they lend a submissive and willing ear to them. For they derive inspiration coupled with pleasure from going through not only the fables of Aesop and the tales of the poets and the *Abaris* of Heraclides and the *Lyco* of Aristo, but also² the doctrines about the souls when these are mixed with mythology.³

¹ Plutarch opens this essay by saying that one should let people whose palate is more sensitive than their mind decide whether it is true, as the poet Philoxenus says (836 (f) *PMG* p. 441), that meats that are not really meat (liver &c. ?) and fish that are not really fish (mussels &c.?) are the most pleasant to the taste.

² The translation follows the text of MSS G²X³V; cp. Alfonsi 1955, 124¹. The reading of MS α (the text of Maximus Planudes), as corrected by a later hand, is defended by Reutern 1933, 2–3, Crönert, and Wehrli. They are followed by Alfonsi 1955, 124; Edelstein 1955, 419; Gigante 1996a, 18–19.

³ On this fragment, see Wehrli on F 33 p. 66; Alfonsi 1955, 124; Gigon 1959, 72; Ioppolo 1980, 276–7⁶⁰; Gigante 1996a, 18–19; Hahm in this volume.

Lives of the Philosophers

See also Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 9.5 = **23**; 9.11–12 = **24A**; 2.22 = **24B**; 10.13–14 = **25**.

On Aristo as author of *Lives of the Philosophers*, see P. Moraux, *Les Listes anciennes des Ouvrages d'Aristote*, Louvain 1951, 243–7; “Diogène Laërce et le *Peripatos*,” *Elenchos* 7 (1986) 249–52; S. N. Mouraviev, “La Vie d’Héraclite de Diogène Laërce. Analyse stratigraphique—Le texte de base—Un nouveau fragment d’Ariston de Céos?,” *Phronesis* 32 (1987) 1–33; M. Gigante, “Aristone di Ceo biografo dei filosofi,” *Studi Classici e Orientali* 46,1 1996 (1998) 17–23.

- 16 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 5.61; 64 (BT 1.352.14–15; 354.12–13 Marcovich)

τοῦ δ' οὖν φυσικοῦ φέρονται καὶ διαθῆκαι τοῦτον
ἔχουσαι τὸν τρόπον· . . .

31 W καὶ αἶδε μὲν εἰσιν αἱ φερόμεναι αὐτοῦ διαθῆκαι,
καθὰ που συνήγαγε καὶ Ἀρίστων ὁ Κεῖος.

1–4 cf. *testamenta a Diogene laudata in* 3.41–3 (Platonis); 5.11–16 (Aristotelis); 5.51–7 (Theophrasti); 5.61–4 (Stratonis); 5.69–74 (Lyconis); 10.16–21 (Epicuri) 2 . . .] *vid. Strato F 10 Wehrli; Lyco 4 SFOD* 3–4 Aristo Ceus F 23 Knögel 4 ὁ Κεῖος] *vid. ad* 3.8

[BPF = Ω = *hyparchetypon*] 4 καθὰ που . . . καὶ] cf. *Plb.* 9.1.4 καθὰ που καὶ παρ' Ἐφόρῳ λέγεται, *et* 3.107.10 καθὰ που καὶ πρότερον εἰρήκαμεν, *quod ad* 1.16.2 *refert* || συνήγαγε] cf. 4.1; 9.40 || ὁ Κεῖος Ω (*errat Wehrli*)

Fragmenta Incertae Sedis

- 17A Paradoxographus Florentinus, *Mirabilia de aquis* 24–7 (PGR 320.63–70; 322.76–94 Giannini)

24 ἐν Κλειτορίοις δὲ τῆς Ἀρκαδίας κρήνην φασὶν εἶ-
ναι, ἀφ' ἧς τοὺς πίνοντας μισεῖν τὸν οἶνον· ἐπικεχά-
ρακται δὲ ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐπίγραμμα τοιόνδε·

ἀγρότα, σὺν ποίμναις τὸ μεσημβρινὸν ἦν σε βαρύνῃ

δίψος ἂν' ἐσχατιᾷς Κλείτορος ἐρχόμενον,

5

τῆς μὲν ἀπὸ κρήνης ἄρυσσαι πόμα· καὶ παρὰ νύμφαις

ὑδριάσι στήσον πᾶν τὸ σὺν αἰπόλιον.

ἀλλὰ σὺ μήτ' ἐπὶ λουτρὰ βάλῃς χροῖ, μή σε καὶ αὔρη

πημὴν ἑρπνῆς ἐντὸς ἐόντα μέθης.

φεύγε δ' ἐμὴν πηγὴν μισάμπελον, ἔνθα Μελάμπους

10

λουσάμενος λύσσης Προϊτίδας ἀργαλέης

πάντα καθαρμὸν ἔκρυσεν ἀπόκρυφον· αἶ γὰρ ἀπ' Ἀργους

οὔρεα τρηχεῖς ἤλυθον Ἀρκαδίδης.

34a W 25 Ἀρίστων δὲ ὁ Περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος ἐν τῇ Κίῳ
πηγὴν φησιν ὕδατος εἶναι, ἀφ' ἧς τοὺς πίνοντας ἀναι- 15
σθήτους γίνεσθαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς· εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτης
ἐπίγραμμα τοιόνδε·

- 16** Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 5.61; 64 (BT 1.352.14–15; 354.12–13 Marcovich)

Now, of the natural philosopher (Strato of Lampsacus) a will is also in circulation, which reads as follows:¹ . . .

And this is his will which is in circulation, such as, if I'm not mistaken, Aristo of Ceos, too, has compiled.²

¹ This passage is part of the *Life* of Strato.

² The testament of Strato is the only instance where Diogenes cites a source. Diogenes does not give a title of a work or make it clear whether all testaments quoted by him derive from Aristo. The manner of introducing the testaments shows marked similarities in the case of Aristotle, Theophrastus, Strato and Lyco, those of Plato and Epicurus being different. That favors restricting a possible collection of testaments made by Aristo to the Peripatetics. On this problem see Zeller 1921, 926³; Gercke *RE* 953–4; Knögel 1933, 75–6; Moraux 1951, 243–5; Gigon 1958, 149³; Gottschalk 1972; Sollenberger 1992, 3859–76; and J. Bollansée on Hermippus 1026 F 28 *FGrH* IV A 3, 304–5.

Fragments of Uncertain Provenance

- 17A** Florentine Paradoxographer, *Wonderful Facts About Waters* 24–7 (*PGR* 320.63–70; 322.76–94 Giannini)¹

- 24 In Clitor in Arcadia they say there is a fountain, and that those who drink from it hate wine. Carved above it is an epigram such as follows:²

Countryman, if mid-day thirst weighs upon you as you
come among the borders of Clitor with your flocks,
draw water to drink from the fountain and bring all your herd
of goats to a halt beside the nymphs of the water.

But do not cast it on your skin to wash, lest the vapor of
strong drink that brings joy trouble you while you are inside.³

Flee my spring that hates the vine, where Melampus,
having washed⁴ the daughters of Proetus free from grievous
madness, secretly hid⁵ all the purificatory material;
for they came⁶ from Argos to the mountains of rough Arcadia.

- 25 Aristo the Peripatetic philosopher says that in Ceos⁷ there is a spring of water, and that those who drink from it become insensitive in their souls.⁸ There is an epigram such as follows on this too:

- ἡδεῖα ψυχροῖο ποτοῦ λιβάς, ἣν ἀναβάλλει
 πηγὴ· ἀλλὰ νόφ πέτρος ὁ τῆσδε πίων.
- 26 ἐν δὲ Σούσοις τῆς Περσίδος ὕδωρ εἶναι λέγουσιν, 20
 ὃ τῶν πiónτων ἐκπίπτειν ποιεῖ παραχρήμα τοὺς ἐμ-
 προσθίους ὀδόντας· κεχάρακται δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτης τὸ
 ἐπίγραμμα τόδε·
 ὕδατα ταῦτα βλέπεις φοβερά, ξένε, τῶν ἄπο χειρσὶ
 λουτρὰ μὲν ἀνθρώποις ἀβλαβῇ ἔστιν ἔχειν· 25
 ἣν δὲ βάλης κοίλης ποτὶ νηδύος ἀγλὰν ὕδωρ,
 ἄκρα μόνον δολιχοῦ χεῖλεος ἀψάμενος,
 αὐτῆμαρ πριστῆρες ἐπὶ χθονὶ δαιτὸς ὀδόντες
 πίπτουσιν, γενύων ὀρφανὰ θέντες ἔδη.
- 27 ἐν δὲ Ἀλλιφάνῳ τῆς Ἰταλίας φρεατίον ἐστι βαθύ, 30
 οὗ τὸ μὲν ὕδωρ βλέπεται, ἡλίκον δὲ ἂν τις χαλάσῃ σχοι-
 νίον, οὐκ ἐφάπτεται τοῦ ὕδατος, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τινος θείου
 κωλύεται, ὥς φησιν Ἰσίγονος.

1–33 *Sotion Paradox.* 24–7 (186.9–188.3 Westermann); *Par. Flor.* Öhler 42.3–43.5 1–29 cf. **17B** 1–2 *Par. Flor.* 12 (= *Isig.* F 6 PGR); *Par. Pal.* 5; *Ath.* 2.19 43F (= *Phylarch.* 81 F 63 FGrH); *Steph. Byz.* s.v. Ἀζανία p. 30.17–19 *Meineke* (= *Eudox.* F 313 *Lasserre*); *Ov., Met.* 15.322–4; *Isid., Etym.* 13.13.2; *EM* 519.53–5 s.v. Κλιτόριον; *EG* 328.25–7 s.v. κλιτοριάζειν; *Ruf. ap. Orib. Coll. Med.* 5.3.35 4–13 143(a) FGE; 215 IGM; cf. **17B.**10–19 10–12 *Steph. Byz.* s.v. Ἀζανία p. 30.19–21 *Meineke* (= *Eudox.* F 313 *Lasserre*); *Ov., Met.* 15.325–8; *Strabo* 8.3.19 346,32–3 C. 14–19 *Aristo Ceus* F 18 *Knögel* 14–16 cf. **17C**; *Isid., Etym.* 13.13.3 14 ὁ Περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος] *vid. ad* **1.1–2 et** **11.3** 18–19 143(b) FGE; 216 IGM; cf. **17B.**25–6 20–2 *Ruf. ap. Orib. Coll. Med.* 5.3.30 24–9 143(c) FGE; 217 IGM; cf. **17B.**33–8 30–3 *Isig.* F 10 PGR

[FVUE; *Vitr.* = **17B**; *Vat.* = **17C**; *Plin.* = **17D**] 6 τὰς *Vitr.* 8 ἀλλὰ σὺ] νάμασι *Vitr.* || βάλης χροῖ] †βατιτεχρα† *Vitr.* 9 τερπνῆς *om. Vitr.* || ἐντὸς ἐόντα] ἐκτὸς ἰόντα *Page* (ἰόντα *iam Preger*) 10 δ' ἐμῇ] δὲ τὴν *Vitr.* 11 λυσάμενος *Vitr.* || Προτίδας *Sylburg*: Προτίδος *codd.*: Προτίδας *Vitr.* || ἀργαλέης] αρτεμείας *Vitr.* 12 ἔκρυσεν *Hecker* 1852, 80–1, *coll. E.*, HF 1070: ἔκοψεν *codd.*, *Vitr.* || αἶ γὰρ *Heringa* 1749, 307: αἶγαρ *codd.* 12–13 αἶγαρ—Ἀρκαδῆς *om. Vitr.* 14 Κίω] Κιλίκια *Vat.*: Chia *Plin.*: Chio *Isid.*: Κέφ *Wehrli*: Χίφ *Ideler* 1841, 186 e *Vitr.* 15 πίνοντας] ἐπιόντας *Vat.* 18 ἡδεῖα—ἀναβάλλει] ἡδέ' ἀπὸ ψυχροῦ πόματος λιβάς ἃ ἀναβαίνει *Vitr.* 19 πῆγη—νόφ *om. Vitr.* || τήνδε *Vitr.* 24 ταῦτα—φοβερά] κρανάεντα βλέπεις *Vitr.* 25 -ς ἀβλαβῇ—ἔχειν *om. Vitr.* 26 βάλης] λάβης *Vitr.* || κοίλου *Vitr.* || ποτὶ νηδύος] †βοτανηδεος† *Vitr.*: κατὰ νηδύος *Hecker* 1852, 83 27 *om. Vitr.* 28 -πὶ χθονὶ—ὀδόντες *om. Vitr.* 33 *post* Ἰσίγονος *habent* περὶ λιμνῶν *VUE*

Pleasant (is) the stream of cold drinking water which the spring sends up, but the person who drinks of this (becomes) a rock in his mind.

- 26 At Susa in Persia they say there is water which makes the front teeth of those who drink from it fall out at once. On this one too there is carved the following epigram:

You see these frightful waters, stranger, from which it is possible for people to obtain water that is harmless for washing their hands, but if you put the sparkling water into your hollow stomach, touching only the edge of the long lip,⁹ that same day your teeth that saw your food will fall on the ground, making bereft their seats in your jaws.

- 27 In Alliphanus in Italy there is a small but deep well, the water of which is visible, but however long a rope one lets down, it does not touch the water but is held back by some divine power, according to Isigonus.

¹ On (the date of) the Florentine (**17A**), Palatine, and Vatican (**17C**) Paradoxographers, see Sharples in this volume. On **17A–D** see Wehrli on F 34–5 p. 67; Knögel on F 18 p. 87–8; and Sharples in this volume.

² On the three epigrams, see Hecker 1852, 80–4; Ellis 1876; Preger, *IGM* 169–72; Öhler 1913, 74–80; 94–96; Page, *FGE* 451–5, and Callebaut in his edition of Vitruvius 119–24.

³ For a discussion of Page’s conjecture ἐκτὸς ἰόντα “when you go outside” for ἐντὸς ἐόντα “while you are inside” of the MSS, see Sharples in this volume (n. 36).

⁴ The text reads “having washed” [λουσάμενος]. The construction with the genitive λύσσης in the sense of “free from (madness)” is peculiar. In Vitruvius (**17B.17**) the text reads “having freed” [λυσάμενος], which makes the construction with the genitive easier; see, however, n. 4 on **17B**. According to Stephanus of Byzantium, *Ethnica* p. 419 under *Lousoi*, Melampus washed [ἔλουσε] the daughters of Proetus at a place called Lousoi [Λουσοί] in the vicinity of Clitor and thus ended their madness [ἔπαυσε τῆς μανίας]; cp. also Pausanias 8.18.7. See also n. 5.

⁵ The translation follows Hecker’s conjecture (ἔκρυπεν). The reading of the MSS in the Florentine Paradoxographer and in Vitruvius (**17B.18**) (ἔκοπεν ἀπόκρυφον) literally means “smote (so as to make) completely hidden.” It is difficult to make sense of that. According to Stephanus of Byzantium, *Ethnica* p. 30 under *Azania*, Melampus threw the “offscourings” [τὰ ἀποκαθάρματα] into the spring.

⁶ The text is corrupt; the translation renders Heringa’s conjecture.

⁷ The Greek has “Cios,” which clearly refers to “Ceos”; cp. n. 6 on **17B** and n. 1 on **17C**.

⁸ For a discussion of the meaning of ἀναίσθητος (“insensitive”), see Sharples in this volume (n. 33).

⁹ I.e., the “lip of the fountain” rather than the “drinker’s lip” (Page, *FGE* 455).

17B Vitruvius, *De architectura* 8.3.21–3 (CB 20.21–22.14 Callebat)

21 Arcadia uero ciuitas est non ignota Clitor, in cuius agris est spelunca profluens aqua, e qua qui biberint, fiunt abstemii. ad eum autem fontem epigramma est in lapide inscriptum hac sententia uersibus Graecis: eam non esse idoneam ad lauandum, sed etiam inimicam uitibus, quod apud eum fontem Melampus sacrificiis purgauisset rabiem Proeti filiarum restituissetque earum uirginum mentes in pristinam sanitatem. epigramma autem est id, quod est subscriptum:

ἀγρότα, σὺν ποιμναῖς τὸ μεσημβρινὸν ἦν σε βαρύνῃ
 δίψος ἀν' ἐσχατιάς Κλείτορος ἐρχόμενον,
 τᾶς μὲν ἀπὸ κρήνης ἄρυσαι πόμα καὶ παρὰ νύμφαις
 ὑδριάσιν στήσον πᾶν τὸ σὺν αἰπόλιον·
 νόμασι μήτ' ἐπὶ λουτρὰ ἴβατιτεχραῖ, μή σε καὶ αὔρη
 πη(μή)νη (***) ἐντὸς ἐόντα μέθης·
 φεῦγε δὲ τὴν πηγὴν μισάμπελον, ἔνθα Μελάμπους
 λυσάμενος λύσσης Προϊτίδας ἀρτεμέας
 πάντα καθαρμὸν ἔκρυπεν ἀπόκρυφον, (*** ***)
 *** ***)

34b W 22 item est in insula Cia fons, e quo qui inprudentes biberint, fiunt insipientes, et ibi est epigramma insculptum ea sententia: iucundam eam esse potionem fontis eius, sed qui biberit, saxeos habiturum sensus. sunt autem uersus hi:

ἡδέ' ἀπὸ ψυχροῦ πόματος λιβάς, ἃ ἀναβαίνει
 (*** ***) πέτρος ὁ τήνδε πιών.

23 Susis autem, in qua ciuitate est regnum Persarum, fonticulus est, ex quo qui biberint, amittunt dentes. item in eo est scriptum epigramma, quod significat hanc sententiam: egregiam esse aquam ad lauandum, sed ea si bibatur, excutere e radicibus dentes. et huius epigrammatis sunt uersus graece:

ὔδατα κρανάεντα βλέπεις, ξένε, τῶν ἄπο χερσὶν
 λουτρὰ μὲν ἀνθρώποι(*** ***)
 ἦν δὲ λάβης κοίλου ἴβοτανήδεος† ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ
 (*** ***)
 αὐτῆμαρ πριστήρες ἐ(*** ***)

17B Vitruvius, *On Architecture* 8.3.21–3 (CB 20.21–22.14 Callebat)¹

- 21 In Arcadia there is the well-known city Clitor, in whose territory there is water flowing forth from a cave. Those who drink from this become teetotalers. And by that spring there is an epigram in Greek verse inscribed in a stone with the following thought: it (the spring water) is not suitable for washing, and is also harmful to vines, because it was at this fountain that Melampus purified the daughters of Proetus from madness by sacrifices and restored the minds of these maidens to their former sanity. The epigram is as follows:²

Countryman, if mid-day thirst weighs upon you as you
come among the borders of Clitor with your flocks,
draw water to drink from the fountain and bring all your herd
of goats to a halt beside the nymphs of the water.
But not with the streams for washing †. . . † lest the vapor of
strong drink < . . . > trouble you while you are inside.³
Flee the spring that hates the vine, where Melampus, having
freed⁴ the daughters of Proetus from madness so as to make them
well, secretly hid⁵ all the purificatory material < . . . >
< >

- 22 Again there is a spring on the island of Ceos⁶ which makes insensitive⁷ those unwise enough to drink from it, and there is found an epigram carved (in stone) with the thought: to drink from this spring is pleasant, but whoever drinks will have senses of stone.⁸ These are the verses:

Pleasant (is) the stream of cold drinking water which comes up
< > who drinks this (becomes) a rock.

- 23 At Susa, the Persian royal capital city, there is a small spring which makes those who drink from it lose their teeth. Again there is an epigram written on it which conveys this thought: the water is excellent for washing, but if it is drunk, one's teeth fall out by their roots. These are the Greek verses of this epigram:

You see the spring waters, stranger, from which < . . . >
for people (to obtain) water for washing their hands.
But if you take the sparkling water † of the hollow † . . . ,
< >,
that same day your < . . . > that saw < > will fall,

πίπτουσιν, γενύων ὀρφανὰ θέντες ἔδη.

1–38 cf. **17A.1–29** 1–3 vid. ad **17A.1–2** 10–19 cf. **17A.4–13**
16–18 vid. ad **17A.10–12** 20–4 Aristo Ceus F 18 Knögel 20–3
cf. **17C** 25–6 cf. **17A.18–19** 33–8 cf. **17A.24–9**

[EGHW; Flor. = **17A**] 1 Clitor edd. : clitori codd. 2 aqua e qua qui
Rose : aquae qua qui E : aquae quo qui G : aquae qui HW 10–19
“epigrammata quae sequuntur om. E; ceteri autem codices uariis
prauisque litterarum formis usi sunt ... codicum GH lectiones adtulimus
easque graecis litteris” Callebat; vid. etiam adn. 2 12 τας GH : τῆς
Flor. 14 ναμασι μητ’ GH : ἀλλὰ σὺ μήτ’ Flor. || †βατιτεχρα† GH :
βάλῃς χροῖ Flor. 15–16 πη(μή)νη—τήν om. G || πημήνη τερπνῆς
ἐντὸς Flor. : πηνης ντυς H 16 δὲ τὴν edd. : δε τη H : δ’ ἐμὴν Flor.
17 λυσάμενος λύσσης edd. : λυσαμενος λυσης H : αμενος ατσης
(vel -σενς) G : λουσάμενος λύσσης Flor. || ἀρτεμέας Schneider :
αρτεμειας GH : ἀργαλέης Flor. 18 εκοψεν GH; vid. ad **17A.12** ||
επακρυπον GH : ἀπόκρυπον Flor. 20 Cia Rose : Chia codd. : Cea
Callebat : Κίω Flor.; vid. ad **17A.14** 25 ἦδε απο ψυχρου ποματος
GH : ἦδεῖα ψυχροῖο ποτοῦ Flor. || α αναβαινει H : α αν ινει G : ἦν
ἀναβάλλει Flor. 26 πηγὴ· ἀλλὰ νόω Flor. : om. GH 29 significat
E : -cant GHW 33 κραναεντα βλεπεις GH : ταῦτα βλέπεις φοβερά
Flor. 34 -ς ἀβλαβῇ ἔστιν ἔχειν Flor. : om. GH 35 λάβῃς] μβηο
GH : βάλῃς Flor. || κοίλης Flor. || βοτανηδεος GH : ποτὶ νηδύος Flor.
|| ἀγλὰν Flor. : ατομ- G : ατμ- H : ἄστομον Ellis 1876, 274 36
ἄκρα μόνον δολιχοῦ χεῖλεος ἀψάμενος Flor. : om. GH 37 -πὶ χθονὶ
δαιτὸς ὀδόντες Flor. : om. GH

17C Paradoxographus Vaticanus 33 (PGR 340.103–6 Giannini)

34c W

Ἀρίστων ὁ Περιπατητικὸς ἐν τῇ Κιλικίᾳ πηγὴν φησιν
ὑδατος εἶναι, ἃφ’ ἧς τοὺς πιόντας ἀναισθήτους
γίνεσθαι.

1–3 Aristo Ceus F 18 Knögel; cf. **17A.14–16**; **17B.20–1**; **17D.2–3**; vid.
ad **17A.14–16** 1 ὁ Περιπατητικὸς] vid. ad **1.1–2**

[V; Flor. = **17A**] 1 Κιλικίᾳ V (e dittographia ΚΙΑΙΚΙΑΙ) ΚΙΑΙΚΙΑΙ
Öhler p. 95; e lapsu oculi librarii de in Cilicia ad in Cea (cf. **17D.1–3**)
Rohde p. 30) : νήσω Κία Giannini : Κέω Wehrli (“Κιλικίᾳ codex e
confusione capitulorum”): Κεῖα Keller p. LXXVIII; vid. ad **17A.14** 2
πιόντας Rohde p. 39 : ἐπιόντας V : πίνοντας Flor.

making bereft their seats in your jaws.

¹ See the notes on **17A**.

² The epigrams in the text of Vitruvius are written in a “mixture of Latin and Greek uncials without word-division, accents, or punctuation” (Page, *FGE* 451). There are a number of omissions in the text of the MSS, indicated by means of asterisks in the text. These are not omissions made by Vitruvius, but rather the result of errors in the transmission of the MSS. For the text in uncials see Preger 1891, 169–72 and Rose’s edition of Vitruvius (1899), 198–200.

³ See note 3 on **17A**.

⁴ The Greek λυσάμενος is an interpretation of the uncials λυσαμενος (cp. n. 2). In view of *purgavisset* in l.7, λυσάμενος appears to be a corruption of λουσαμενος in the Florentine Paradoxographer (**17A**.11) rather than the other way around; see note 4 on **17A**.

⁵ See note 5 on **17A**.

⁶ The MSS read *Chia*. This has been changed into *Cia* by Rose (cp. Florentine Paradoxographer [**17A**.14]), into *Cea* by Callebat (cp. Pliny [**17D**.3]). Conversely, in Pliny, Serbat has changed the reading of the MSS *Cea* into *Chia*, on the basis of the reading of the MSS in Vitruvius and the reading *Chio* in Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae* 13.13.2 (which derives from Pliny).

⁷ See note 8 on **17A**.

⁸ Vitruvius here does not mention his source (Aristo in **17A**.14). In 8.3.27, however, he mentions a number of Greek sources: Theophrastus, Timaeus, Posidonius, Hegesias, Herodotus, Aristides, and Metrodorus. Although Aristides has been tentatively identified as Aristides of Miletus (286 *FGrH*), it has also been suggested that the name of Aristides should be emended to that of Aristo; see, however, Callebat p. 131–2, and Sharples in this volume.

17C Vatican Paradoxographer 33 (*PGR* 340.103–6 Giannini)

Aristo the Peripatetic says that in Cilicia¹ there is a spring of water, and that those who drink from it become insensitive.²

¹ Comparison with the Florentine Paradoxographer (**17A**.14), Vitruvius (**17B**.20), and Pliny (**17D**.3) makes clear that “in Cilicia” must be a mistake for “in Ceos.” For possible explanations of the mistake see the *apparatus criticus* and Sharples in this volume.

² See note 8 on **17A**.

17D Plinius, *Naturalis Historia* 31.15–16 (CB 32.10–16 Serbat)

- 35 W in Cilicia apud oppidum Cescum riuus fluit Nuus, ex
 quo bibentium subtiliores sensus fieri M. Varro tradit, at
 in Cea insula fontem esse, quo hebetes fiant, Zamae in
 16 Africa, ex quo canorae uoces. uinum taedio uenire iis,
 qui ex Clitorio lacu biberint, ait Eudoxus, et Theopom- 5
 pus inebriari fontibus iis, quos diximus.

2–3 *Aristo Ceus* F 18 *Knögel*; cf. **17A.14–16**; **17B.20–1**; **17C**; vid. ad
17A.14–16 4–5 *Eudox. F 314 Lasserre*; cf. **17A.1–2**; **17B.1–3**; vid.
 ad **17A.1–2** 5–6 *Theopomp. 115 F 278e et 320 FG rH* 6 quos
 diximus] vid. 2.230

[*VRrEaFXTd*; *Gelen.* = *S. Gelenii editio Basileensis 1554*; *Hardouin* =
editio Parisina 1655] 1 cescum *Gelen.*: uiscum *VFRa*: uisgum *rEX*
 ll nuus *rEa*: nouus *VFR*: unus *X*: nous *Serbat* 3 Cea *codd.*: Chia
Serbat; vid. ad **17A.14** ll fiant *VFRXTd*: fieri *Ea* 4 uenire *REaX*:
 ueniret *VFd^l*: uenit *Td²* 5 ait *Hardouin*: att *EA*: at *TdX*: ad *VFR*

III. AMPHISBETOUMENA

De senectute [Τιθωνός vel Περὶ γήρως? **18**]**18** Cicero, *Cato Maior de Senectute* 1.3 (56.5–16 Powell)

- 3 sed de ceteris et diximus multa et saepe dicemus: hunc
 12 W librum ad te de senectute misimus. omnem autem
 sermonem tribuimus non Tithono, ut Aristo Chius—par-
 um enim esset auctoritatis in fabula—sed Marco Catoni
 seni, quo maiorem auctoritatem haberet oratio; apud 5
 quem Laelium et Scipionem facimus admirantes quod is
 tam facile senectutem ferat, eisque eum respondentem.
 qui si eruditius uidebitur disputare, quam consuevit ipse
 in suis libris, attribuito litteris Graecis, quarum constat
 eum perstudiosum fuisse in senectute. sed quid opus est 10
 plura? iam enim ipsius Catonis sermo explicabit nostram

17D Pliny, *Natural History* 31.15-16 (CB 32.10–16 Serbat)

A stream called Nuus flows by the town of Cescum in Cilicia. Marcus Varro records that the senses of those who drink from this (stream) become keener, but that on the island of Ceos¹ there is a spring that makes them duller, (and) at Zama in Africa one which
 16 makes voices tuneful. Eudoxus says that wine becomes unpleasant to those who have drunk from the lake of Clitor, and Theopompus that people are made drunk by the fountains that we have mentioned.

¹ See **17A** n. 7; **17B** n. 6 and **17C** n. 1.

III. DISPUTED

On Old Age [*On Old Age* or *Tithonus*? **18**]

18 Cicero, *Cato Maior On Old Age* 1.3 (56.5–16 Powell)

3 Now on the other subjects, we have both said much and shall often have much to say; this book, which we have sent to you,¹ is on old age. The entire discourse, however, we have attributed, not to Tithonus,² as Aristo of Chios (did)³ — for there would be too little authority in a tale —, but to Marcus Cato in his old age,⁴ to ensure that the words (of the discourse) may have greater authority; and we placed Laelius and Scipio⁵ at Cato's house, expressing wonder that he bears his old age so easily, and we have Cato replying to them. And if he will appear to argue in a more learned manner than he is accustomed to do in his own books, give credit to Greek literature, which he, as is known for a fact, cultivated assiduously in his old age. But what more need we say? For from here on the dis-

omnem de senectute sententiam.

2–5 *Aristo Ceus* T 6 Knögel; *Aristo Chius* Ioppolo 1980, 331 (“testimonianze mancanti negli SVF”) 2 de senectute] cf. Περὶ γήρωος α’ D.L. 5.43 (*Theophrasti* = 436 no. 18 FHS&G); Περὶ γήρωος α’ D.L. 5.81 (*Demetrii Phalerei* = 81 no. 2 SOD) 3 Chius] vid. ad 3.8 5 quo—oratio] cf. 9.10 8–9 qui si—libris] *Charis. Ars Gram. II*, p. 198 Keil (BT 258.15–16 Barwick)

[PVBLAD saec. IX; OM saec. X/XI; RaViH saec. XI; RZ saec. XI/XII; S saec. XII ineunte; BeQEAdMcValTSb saec. XII; LaLbSt recentiores; β=BLAD; vid. etiam Wuilleumier et Ranocchia 2003] 3 non tithono (tithono L²) PVBL²A: catonis non tithono D: non sit homo L¹ || ut] aut PHL²D²Q¹ || Aristo Chius βO (Aristochius E): Aristo PHRaL²Q: Aristoteles VViSZAd: Aristoteles M: Aristhoteles Va: Aristotiles BeIT: Aristoceus RMc: Aristo Cheus SbLaLbSt, recc.: Aristotheus, Aristoteus, Aristeus recc. 9 attribuito P¹VA²: id attribuito P²L²: id tribuito L¹D²: id tribuitur A¹D¹: id tribulato B

De adulatione [Περὶ κολακείας? *19–20]

- *19 Philodemus, *De vitiis* 1 = Περὶ κολακείας, *PHerc.* 222, col. 10.1–10 (CErc 11.108.28–31 Gargiulo)

[. i]κανὰ ταῦτα [. .]εφι
[. οἷ]ησιν εἶναι τὴν [πρ]αό-
[τητα πρὸς] τὸν κόλακα φιλο-
[.] οὐχ οἷον ἱκαν[ῶ]ς ο-
5 [. κ]αθάπερ Ἀρίστ[ω]ν ἔ-
[φησεν, ἀλλ’]λὰ μόνιόν ἐστι τῶν
[ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ π]αραλελειμμέ[νω]ν,
[ὅπερ διεσαφ]ήσαμεν ἡμε[ῖς. ᾗ]λ-
[λο μὲν γάρ] τὸ μιμεῖσθαί τ[ιν’], ἔ-
10 [τερον δὲ] τὸ ζηλοῦν κα[. . .]το

subscriptio PHerc 222 Φιλοδήμου | Περὶ κακίων καὶ τῶν | ἄντικει-
μένων ἀρετῶν καὶ τῶν | ἐν οἷς εἰσι καὶ περὶ ᾧ | A | ὅ [ἐ]στι | Περὶ
κολακείας (cf. ad 21a); *de numero A pro Z quem legit Gargiulo* 103,
vid. Angeli 1994, 77 et cf. Capasso 1997, 149 2 [οἷ]ησιν: cf. 21e.9,
21g.30–1, 21h.20, 21j.3–4 5 Ἀρίστ[ω]ν: cf. 20.38; 21a.10; 21g.34

course of Cato himself will unfold all our thoughts on old age.⁶

¹ Cicero is addressing Titus Pomponius Atticus. The dialogue was written in 44 B.C.; the dramatic date is 150 B.C.

² Son of the Trojan king Laomedon, who because of his beauty was carried off by Eos. She begged Zeus to make him immortal, but forgot to ask to make him ageless as well. So Tithonus slowly shrivelled away and ended up as a wizened, piping husk, locked away in a room by Eos (*Hymn. Hom. Ven.* 218–38).

³ Powell prints *Ceus*. According to him (102) the MSS provide no good ground for choosing between *Ceus* or *Chius*. See, however, Ranocchia 2003, who argues that *Chius* is most probably the correct reading.

⁴ Marcus Porcius Cato (234–149 B.C.).

⁵ Gaius Laelius and Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus.

⁶ This passage is included as a fragment of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli and Knögel, as one of Aristo of Chios by Ioppolo 1980, 331 (but not by Arnim). On this fragment, see Wehrli on F 12 p. 51–2; Knögel on T 6 p. 80–2; Ioppolo 1980, “I frammenti di controversa attribuzione: il *Cato Maior*,” 292–308; Lancia 1980, 282–3; Powell p. 269–72; Caujolle-Goulet, *DPhA* 1 (1989) 399–400. It is taken to refer to Aristo of Ceos by Ritschl 1842; Zeller 1921, 926²; Susemihl *GGL*, 1.151; Gercke 1892, 203; Philippson 1934, 1333; Alfonsi 1955; Powell p. 272; to Aristo of Chios by Giesecke 1892, 209–10; Fornara 1966, 121–3.

On Flattery [*On Flattery?* *19–20] On Flattery [

*19 Philodemus, *On Vices* 1 = *On Flattery*, *PHerc.* 222, col. 10.1–10 (*CErc* 11.108.28–31 Gargiulo)¹

... adequate that ... that (adopting) a mild manner towards the flatterer is (a form of) self-conceit² ... not such as in an adequate way ... in the way Aristo has said, but is part of the things that have been omitted by him, as we have made quite clear. For (it is) one thing to imitate someone, another to emulate (someone) ...³

¹ The *subscriptio* of *PHerc.* 222 shows that it is part of Philodemus' *On Vices*, and that it is about *flattery*. The *subscriptio* also gives the number of the book of *On Vices*: Gargiulo reads the number 7 (= the letter Z in Greek alphabetical numbering), but Angeli 1994, 77 has argued that the number is not 7, but 1 (= the letter A), which due to an ornamental flourish was misread by Francesco Casanova in 1817. On the basis of this new reading (which is rejected by Gigante 2000b, 121), Capasso 1997, 149 argues that the first three books of *On Vices* all deal with flattery, the first being preserved in *PHerc.* 222, the second in *PHerc.* 1457, and the third in *PHerc.* 1675; cp. n. 1 on 20. On the contents of *PHerc.* 222, see Gargiulo 1981, 105–6. On Philodemus' concept of flattery, see Longo Auricchio 1986.

papyrus deperdita est. superest nil nisi apographum Neapolitanum. ed. T. Gargiulo, CErc 11 (1981) 108; 110; 123–4 1–10 Gargiulo 3–4 φιλοψευδῆ Gargiulo 108 5–6 cf. Phld., Div. col. 40.8–9 καθάπερ ἔφησε Πολύβαινος 6–8 cf. Phld., Rhet. 2 col. 23.3–6 Longo περὶ τῶν ἰ καὶ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν παραλείλειμμένων, ὥς ὑποδειδείχαμεν 8 an [παρεστ]ήσαμεν? Gargiulo 123; cf. 21a.18

- 20** Philodemus, *De vitiis* 2 = Περὶ κολακείας, *PHerc.* 1457, col. 11.37–42 (fr. 23) (*CErc* 4.54.7–9 Kondo)

15 W ὁ μέντοι φιλέ-
 παινος ὑπ’ Ἀρίστωνος κα-
 λούμενος καὶ χαρακτηρι-
 40 ζό[μ]ενος οὗτ’ εἰ συνήθ{ε} ἡ’ς ἐσ-
 τὴν οὐ[τ]ω διαφέρων οὐθ’ ὅ-
 [λως]

subscriptio PHerc. 1457 Φιλοδήμου Περὶ κακιῶν; *de titulo in initio papyri reperto vid. Capasso 1997, 147–9, qui legit* [Φιλο]δη[μο]υ ἰ [Περὶ κακι]ῶν καὶ τῶν ἰ [ἀντικειμένων] ἀρ[ετῶν] ἰ [B] ἰ [ὅ ἐ]στι ἰ [Περὶ] κολ[ακείας] *vel* [Περὶ τῶν] κολ[ακείαι ὁμοειδῶν] 37–42 *Aristo Ceus F 24 Knögel 38 Ἀρίστωνος: cf. 19.5; 21a.10; 21g.34*

37–42 *edd. W. Crönert, KuM (1906) 34–5 et 178³⁴; D. Bassi PE I (1914) 17–18; C. Jensen, Hermes 46 (1911) 405–6 et apud Knögel 1933, 89; E. Kondo, CErc 4 (1974) 53–4; denuo papyrus inspexit A. Angeli 40 οὗτ’ εἰ Crönert, Jensen, Bassi: οὗτε Jensen ap. Knögel, Wehrli II in papyro CYNHΘEC legitur H supra E suprascripto: συνήθης Jensen, Crönert, Wehrli: σύνηθές Bassi 41 οὐ[τω δι]αφέρων Crönert, Bassi, Jensen: οὐ[τε δι]αφέρων Jensen ap. Knögel, Wehrli 41–2 οὐθ’ ὅλως Crönert, Bassi*

De arrogantia [Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας? 21a–o]

- 21a** Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 10.10–35 (BT 16 – 18 Jensen)

13I W 10 _____ Ἀρίστων
 το[ί]γυν [γ]εγραφώς Περὶ τοῦ

² Lines 1–4 are too damaged to make much sense, but if the supplements in lines 2–3 are correct, Philodemus appears to criticize “(adopting) a mild manner towards flatterers” as a form of “self-conceit.”

³ This passage was not known to the editors of the fragments of Aristo of Ceos. Gargiulo 1981, 123 mentions the two possibilities, Aristo of Ceos and Aristo of Chios, referring to Jensen 1911 and Knögel 1933 for the former, to Gallavotti 1927 for the latter; see further **21a** n. 1. On this fragment, see Gargiulo 1981, 123; Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 214–5; and Dorandi in this volume.

20 Philodemus, *On Vices* 2 = *On Flattery*, *PHerc.* 1457, col. 11.37–42 (fr. 23) (*CErc* 4.54.7–9 Kondo)¹

. . .² The person, however, who by Aristo is called and characterized (as) “lover of praise,” neither (is he), if (that term) is in common use,³ so (very) different (from the person *who loves to please*) nor wholly . . .⁴

¹ The *subscriptio* of *PHerc.* 1457 shows that it is part of Philodemus’ *On Vices*, without further specification. The contents of *PHerc.* 1457 are similar to those of *PHerc.* 222 (**19**); see Dorandi & Stein 1994, 1². Capasso 1997, 147–9 has proposed a reconstruction of the *inscriptio* of *PHerc.* 1457, placing *PHerc.* 1457 in Book 2 of *On Vices*, thus following after Book 1 in *PHerc.* 222 (see **19** n. 1). Book 1 would then deal with flattery as such; Book 2 with related vices.

² In ll. 28–37 Philodemus mentions the person who “loves to please” [ἀρεσκευτικός], and refers to his own work *On Beauty and Eros*.

³ In line 40 an H is written above the E of σύνηθεξ, which implies a correction of the neuter σύνηθεξ into the masculine συνήθηξ. The word *philepainos* is not attested elsewhere before the 4th century A.D.

⁴ Jensen 1911, 405–6 took this fragment to refer to Aristo of Ceos, because in the preceding columns 6 and 7 Theophrastus’ *Character* 5 [Ἀρέσκεια] is quoted *verbatim* (Theophrastus is named in col. 5.40). He is followed by Knögel and Wehrli. On this fragment, see Wehrli on F 15 p. 61–2; Kondo 1974, 53–4; Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 215; and Dorandi in this volume.

On Arrogance [*On Relieving Arrogance?* **21a–o**]

21a Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 10.10–35 (BT 16–18 Jensen)¹

Aristo,² then, having written a letter *On Relieving Arrogance*, has indeed experienced something more naive³ than these (people

κο[υ]φίζ[ειν ὑ]περηφανίας ἐ-
 πιστολή[ν τ]ι [ῆ]διον μὲν ἔ-
 παθεν τῶν διὰ τύχην ὑπερ-
 15 ηφ[ά]νων [ἐκ]είνων, οὐ μό-
 νο[ν] διὰ τ[ιν] ἄ[λλ]ὰ πὸ ταύτης ὑπερ-
 ηφανοῦν[τω]ν, ἀλλὰ καὶ
 δι' ἃ προείπαμεν ἡμεῖς, καὶ
 δη[τ]α καὶ δι' αὐτὴν φιλοσο-
 20 φί[αν] πολλῶν δοξάντων,
 ὥς [Ἑρ]ακλείτου καὶ Πυθαγό-
 ρου καὶ Ἑ[μ]πεδοκλέους καὶ
 Σωκράτους καὶ ποιητῶν ἐνί-
 ων οὓς οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν κω-
 25 μωιδογράφων ἐπεράπιζον.
 ἀλλ' ὅμως, εἴ τινα πείσει, κ[α-]
 θάπ[ερ] οὐκ ἂν ἀπεικ(ότ)ως τι-
 νὰ πείσειεν περὶ ὧν ἀπετέ-
 μετο, κεφαλαιώσομαι τὰς
 30 δυνάμεις αὐτῶν. ἐάν π[ο-]
 τε συναισθάνηται μετεω-
 [ρ]ιζό[μεν]ος, μεταρίπτειν
 τὴν δι[άνοι]αν ἐπὶ τὰς ἔμ-
 προσθε [ταπ]εινώσεις ὑπὸ
 35 τῆς τύχης, εἵποτε γεγόνασιν . . .

subscriptio: Φιλοδήμου | περὶ κακιῶν | I; cf. ad **19, 20** de papyro PHerc. 1008 vid. Jensen p. VI–XIII; Bassi 1913, 450; Jensen 1933, 6–9; Dürr 1987; Indelli 2001; Ranocchia 2001, 236–43; Indelli 2003 apographi Oxoniensis PHerc. 1008 exemplar Academia Oxoniensis lithographice excudi curavit in Herculanensium Voluminum parte prima, Oxonii 1824, 1–26 (= HV); ex apographis Neapolitanis pr. ed. L. Caterino, Herculanensium Voluminum quae supersunt. Collectio prior, Tomus 3, Neapoli 1827, 1–54 (= VH) cols. 10–24 (**21a–o**) ex VH edd. H. Sauppe 1853, 17–33; J.A. Hartung 1857, 70–88; J.L. Ussing 1868, 43–60; ex papyro ed. C. Jensen BT 1911 p. 16–43 (= Jensen) cols. 16–20 (**21g–k**) ex VH ed. L. Spengel 1838, 1012–23 cols. 10 (**21a**) et 21–3 (**21l–n**) denuo ex papyro edd. E. Acosta Méndez & A. Angeli 1992, 151–4 (= A.-A.) et G. Ranocchia 2001, 244–50 (= Ranocchia) 10–35 vid. Knögel 1933, 8–9; A.-A. 151–2 (= Socrates T 4), 182–3, 208–19 10–30 papyrum denuo inspexit A. Angeli, quam sequimur; vid. etiam Jensen 1911, 397–8; Gallavotti 1927, 473–4¹; Capasso 1983, 452–3; Mouraviev 1986, 22–3; Dorandi et Ranocchia in hoc volumine

who are) arrogant on account of (good) fortune, (these) being arrogant not only on account of circumstances deriving from that (good fortune), but also on account of what we have mentioned earlier, and indeed many also having given that impression (of being arrogant) on account of philosophy itself, such as Heraclitus and Pythagoras and Empedocles and Socrates and certain poets,⁴ whom the older comic poets used to censure (for this). But still, in case some (of the things he says) will convince,⁵ as it would not be at all improbable that some would convince concerning things he has set apart for himself,⁶ I will summarize their main points.

(Aristo says that), if ever (one) becomes aware of becoming puffed up (with arrogance),⁷ (one is) to turn back (one's) mind to the previous humiliations caused by fortune,⁸ if ever they have taken place . . .

¹ The *subscriptio* shows that *PHerc.* 1008 contains Book 10 of Philodemus' treatise *On Vices*. The preserved text numbers 25 columns, about a quarter of the total size of the book (Jensen p. vii). At the beginning of each column *ca.* 10 lines are missing (Jensen p. viii). These 25 columns are at the *end* of the book (Gigante 1996b). For an introduction to Book 10, see Tsouna in this volume; Tsouna 2004 provides an English translation with notes.

In col. 10 Philodemus, after introductory remarks concerning Aristo in ll. 10–25 (**21a.10–25**), announces that he will *summarize* the “main points” of what Aristo has written on arrogance. This summary in indirect speech runs from cols. 10.30 to 16.27 (**21a.30–21g.27**), where it is rounded off with a closing formula (16.27–8 = **21g.27–8**). In cols. 16.29–24.21 (**21g.29–21o.21**) Philodemus then *quotes* (as is shown by φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων “Aristo says” in col. 16.34 = **21g.34**) a number of character-sketches by Aristo. After that, the book as a whole is rounded off with a closing formula (col. 24.21–7).

In these columns an unspecified Aristo is mentioned twice: cols. 10.10 (**21a.10**) and 16.34 (**21g.34**). Luigi Caterino, the first editor of the papyrus, proposed to identify this Aristo as Aristo of Chios on the basis of a mistaken reading of col. 16.34–6 (see Sauppe 1853, 6, and the *apparatus criticus* of **21g.34–5**); and reading ἐπ[ίσ]τολ[ι]μαίων βιβλίου in col. 10.12–13, he identified the “book of letters” as one of the 4 books of Letters mentioned by Diogenes Laertius in his list of works by Aristo of Chios (**8.16**). Sauppe 1853, 6–7 (cp. p. 34) was the first to propose Aristo of Ceos and, reading τὸ βιβλίον in l. 13, he connected this “book” with the *Notes on Empty Conceit* in the same list of works (= **8.8**) (but see Giesecke 1891, 64¹). Sauppe was followed by Gercke 1892, 200–3; Jensen 1911; Philippson 1912, 391 & 1934; Knögel 1933; Rostagni 1955, 351–2; and Wehrli, who includes cols. 10–24 as F 13–14 in his edition of the fragments of Aristo of Ceos. From Gercke & Jensen onwards there appears to have been a near-consensus (Mayer 1907–10, 487 has doubts) in favor of Aristo of

10–20 *vid. Gallavotti 1933, 31–3* 10 Ἀρίστων: *vid. 21g.34 et 21o.17; cf. 19.5; 20.38* 19–25 *Empedocles T 88 Gallavotti; cf. Gallavotti 1975* 21 [Ἦρ]ακλείτου: *cf. D.L. 9.1* 21–2 Πυθαγ-όρου: *cf. D.L. 8.4 et 36* 22 Ἐ[μ]πεδοκλέους: *cf. D.L. 8.66* 23 Σωκράτους: *cf. 21l.35–7; 21m.36; 21n.36*

[O = *apographum Oxoniense*; N¹ et N² = *apographa Neapolitana*, a. 1795/8 ab G. Casanova et a. 1806 ab A. Lentari facta; N = *collatio utriusque apographi Neapolitani*; Jensen² = *Jensen ap. Knögel 1933, 8–9*] *initio singularum columnarum desunt decem fere lineae; vid. Jensen p. viii* 10 ante Ἀρίστων *spatium vacuum* 11–12 *Caterino* 12–13 ἐπιστολή[v] *Angeli*: ἐπι[.]ολ[.....]λιον *N*: [ε]πι[.]τομα[.]α[.]διον *O*: ἐπι[στ]ολ[ήν] *Jensen*: ἐπιστολ[ήν] *Gallavotti 1927*: ἐπιστολή[v] *A.-A.*: ἐπιστολ[ι]κά *Gigante 1997a*: ἐπιστολικὰ *Ranocchia*: ἐπιτο[μήν] *Jensen 1930, 58¹¹, Wehrli*: ἐπι[τ]ομ[ήν] *Capasso* 13 *vid. ad 12–13*; [τ]ι [ή]διον *Angeli*: [τὸ ἴ]διον *Jensen²*: τ[ὸ ἴ]διον *Ranocchia*: *spatio longius* [πᾶν ἴ]διον *Gallavotti 1927* (πᾶντ' 1933) et [τιν' ἴ]διον *Philippson 1912, 392* 13–14 ἔπαθεν *Jensen*: ἔπαθεν *Ranocchia*: ἔπαθεν *Capasso*: ἔπαθεν *A.-A.*: *contra vestigia papyri* ἔβλεπεν *Rieth 1936, 619, Wehrli et ἔγραφεν Mouraviev* 15 [ἐκ]εῖνων, οὐ *Angeli*: ηφ[.]ω[.....]ων ου *N*: ηφ[.]ων[....]ων ου *O*: [ὄντ]ων· οὐ *A.-A.*: [ἐτ]αί[ρ]ων, οὐ *Ranocchia in hoc volumine* ([ἀφρό]νων 2001): [θιγ]ών (μόνον). Οὐ *Sudhaus ap. Jensen*: [θιγ]ών, οὐ *Gallavotti 1927*: [μόν]ων—οὐ *Wehrli, Capasso*: [σοφ]ών—οὐ *Jensen²* (*cf. 40¹*): *spatio longius* [ἀνδρ]ών, οὐ *Mouraviev* 16 *post* [ἐκ]εῖνων *spatium vacuum* 16 διὰ τ[ιν' ἄ]πὸ *Angeli*: νο[.]δ[.]λ[....]ct *N*: νο[.]ιαι[....]ot *O*: διὰ τ[ιν' ἄ]πὸ *Gigante ap. Capasso*: δ[ι]ὰ τ[ιν' ἄ]πὸ *A.-A.*: δ[ι]ὰ τ[ιν' ἄ]πὸ *Wehrli*: διὰ τᾶ [ύ]πὸ *Ranocchia*: δ[ι]ὰ τ[ὸ ἄ]πὸ *Jensen²*: δ' ἄ[π]ι' ἀ[ύτῃ]ς *Jensen*: δ' ἄρ[α ἄ]πὸ *Gallavotti 1933* 19 δῆ[τα] *Gallavotti 1927* 27 ἀπεικ[ό]τως: *corr. Sauppe* 28–9 ἀπετέλετο *Ranocchia*: ἐπετέλετο *Jensen², Wehrli, Capasso, A.-A.*: *contra vestigia papyri* [προ]ε[ί]λετο *Jensen, Gallavotti 1927 et ἐξ-ε(ί)λετο vel ἐφε(ί)λετο Gigante 1997a* 29 κεφαλαιώσομαι: *cf. Gigante 1997a, 154*

21b Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 11.1–35 (BT 18–20 Jensen)

αδι [κου-]
φίσαι τοῦ πι[κροῦ]
φλέγματος ἐγ . . . αι

1311 W

τι μέρος. — καὶ [. λα]μ-
5 βάνειν πρ[ὸ] ὀφ[θαλ]μ[ῶν] τὸ
τῆς [τ]ύ[χη]ς . . ε . . ι . . νες καὶ

Ceos. But recently Ioppolo 1996 has followed Gallavotti (1927 & 1933, 30) in attributing the work to Aristo of Chios; see also Ranocchia in this volume. On this question, see also Dorandi and Tsouna in this volume.

² For a summary of the scholarly discussion on the interpretation of ll. 10–35, see Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 208–14; see also Dorandi and Ranocchia in this volume. The text printed here is based on the most recent inspection of the papyrus by A. Angeli, and the interpretation is that proposed by her, for which see Dorandi in this volume.

³ For this pregnant use of the comparative of ἡδύς, see Angeli, as quoted by Dorandi in this volume.

⁴ It is usually assumed that Philodemus is referring to tragic poets such as Euripides and Agathon.

⁵ The indefinite pronouns *τινα* in ll. 26 & 27–8 are here taken to be the *subject* of the verb “convince” (πείσει l. 26 & πείσεται l. 28), the object being an understood “someone/the reader”; usually, they are taken to be the *object*.

⁶ The Greek *middle* aorist ἀπετέμετο (“he has set apart for himself”)—apart from conveying the *metaphorical* use of the verb “cut off”—appears to be used by Philodemus to stress that Aristo has made *his own selection* of the material to be dealt with by him.

⁷ On this phrase (literally “elevated,” i.e., “riding a high horse”), see Knögel 1933, 13¹; 58–9².

⁸ From μεταρίπτειν in l. 32 onwards a whole string of infinitives (connected by καί, δέ or δὲ καί) is used by Philodemus: **21b**.4–5, 13, 26, 33; **21c**.4, 12–13, 30; **21d**.8, 30; **21e**.2–3, 36; **21f**.13, 22, 33; and **21g**.2–3, 15. These infinitives indicate that Philodemus is summarizing (in indirect speech) the precepts given by Aristo in his work on arrogance. Cp. Jensen 1911, 399–400; Knögel 1933, 13; Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 218; Dorandi and Ranocchia in this volume.

21b Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 11.1–35 (BT 18–20 Jensen)¹

. . . to relieve (*or* have relieved) of the bitter . . . bile . . . some part.²— And (Aristo says that one is) to set before (one’s) eyes³ the . . .⁴ and sharp twists of fortune . . . bearing in mind (?) the (passage) of Euripides (which?) . . .⁵ Dionysius⁶ was quite right in

- ὀξύς[τρ]οφο[ν] . . . ἰς . αἰγῶ . το
 φερόμενους τὸ Εὐ[ριπίδο]ν . .
 ξοῖμ[. . .] ἰ Διον[ύ]σ[ιος] οὐ κακῶ[ς]
 10 ἐπιφωνεῖν ἐκέλευέν τινα
 δις τῇ[ς] ἡμέρας· “ὄρᾱς τυ[ρά]ν-
 νους δ[ιὰ μ]ακ[ρ]ῶν [ἡ]ὺ[ξ]ημ[έ]-
 νους;” — [κ]αὶ μν[ῆμ]ονεῦειν ἐ . .
 ναρ λο . τ . τον α . τος
 15 διετ πρὸς ὑ[περ]φανή-
 σαντα . α . . να τοῦ παρα-
 δείγματο[ς . . .] εν. ωτερ . . .
 αὐτὸς γρά[φει·] κ[α]θάπερ κα[ὶ]
 Δίων πρὸς Πτο[λί]δωρον τὸν
 20 Μεγαρέα [πολὺν χ]ρόνον ἐ-
 πὶ τῆς θύρ[ας περιμ]ένων, πρὸς
 [τ]ὸ[ν ἄ]κόλ[ουθ]όν “ἦ που καὶ
 ἡμεῖς” εἶπ[ε]ν “ἐκεῖ πολλὰ το[ι-]
 αὐτ’ ἐποίη[σ]εν”. — [κ]αὶ ὅταν ἐ-
 25 πὶ τὰς εὐκ[λ]ηρίας ἐφιστάνηι,
 μὴ προσεπιρητορεύ[ειν] αὐ-
 ταῖς πρὸς τὸ μεῖ[ζ]ον, [ἀλλ’] ἀπ[ο-]
 σπᾶν ὅτι δύναται· † κουφίζε[ιν]
 τῆς ἰσχνότητος πέφυκ[εν·]
 30 ὥς καὶ Περικλῆς ταπε[ינוυ-]
 μένους μὲν ἐξῆρεν Ἀ[θηναί-]
 [ους, μεγαλ]αυχουμέν[ους δὲ]
 σ[υνέ]στ[ειλ]ε· καὶ μὴ δ[. . . .]
 πιν α τὰγαθὰ μέχρι
 35 ἂν ὑπερθαρῶν παύσεται με-

[vid. ad **21a**] 2–3 τοῦ πι[κροῦ . . .] φλέγματος: vid. Knögel 1933, 59²
 6–24 denuo post Jensen edidit Knögel 1933, 11 9 Διον[ύ]σ[ιος]: cf.
21d.18–22 11–13 Eur. F 420.1 TrGF Kannicht = 548 Mette = Ino 17
 Jouan & Van Looy = Stob., Anth. 4.41.1; PCairo 65445, 126–9 (saec.
 III^e; edd. O. Guéraud et P. Jouguet, *Un Livre d’Écolier du III^e Siècle*
avant J.-C., 1938, 16); cf. Philostr., VA 7.5; [Plu.], Cons. ad Apol. 6
 104A (= Dem. Phal. 83 SOD) 18–24 Plu., Dio 17.9–10; Val. Max.
 4.1 ext. 3 30–3 cf. Thuc. 2.65.9; Plu., Per. 15.2

[vid. ad **21a**; Jensen² = Jensen ap. Knögel 1933, 11] 1–9 Jensen
 2–4 τοῦ πι[κρατοῦ]ντος | φλέγματος ἐγ[λε]αί[νοντάς] | τι μέρος Phi-

ordering someone to pronounce twice a day: “Do you see tyrants having grown powerful after a long period of time?”⁷— And (Aristo says that one is) to remember³ . . . towards (someone) who has behaved arrogantly . . . the example . . . he himself writes.⁸ Just as Dio, too, (did) towards Ptoiodorus of Megara, (when Dio) waiting a long time at the door, said to his attendant: “Well, I guess, we too often behaved like this over there.”⁹— And (Aristo says that), whenever (one) dwells upon (one’s) good fortunes,¹⁰ (one is) not to add to them³ with rhetorical verbiage to make them greater, but to detract (from them) what (one) can; †relieving the reducedness (of mind) is natural†;¹¹ as also Pericles lifted up the (spirit of the) Athenians when they were brought low, but made them contract sail when they were in a boasting mood; and (that) one is not to . . .¹² the good things until one has stopped being overconfident . . .

¹ See **21a** n. 1.

² Philippson’s supplements in ll. 2–3 would give “of the prevailing bile smoothing away some part.”

³ For the use of the infinitive, see **21a** n. 7.

⁴ Jensen’s supplement would give “inclining to the other (worse) side”; that of Philippson “obscure.”

⁵ With Jensen’s new readings, the text in ll. 4–9 would according to Knögel 1933, 11 run as follows: “And that he is to keep before his eyes the fickleness of fortune, and that people walking on ice, quote the verse of Euripides, which Dionysius too . . .”; see, however, Philippson 1934, 1331. Philippson’s supplement in l. 7 would give “as an antidote.” Tsouna translates (with Delattre’s supplement in l. 7) “warmly endorsing the phrase of Euripides, according to whom . . .”

⁶ Probably Dionysius I (ca. 432–367 BC), tyrant of Syracuse. Philippson’s supplement in l. 8–9 “which for the benefit of his son” entails a reference to the son, Dionysius II, who was tyrant of Syracuse 367–357 & 346–343 BC. This son is also referred to in l. 17, if Philippson’s supplement there (“the younger one”) is correct.

⁷ Rather than “Do you see tyrants prospering for a long time?” (Tsouna; similarly Jouan & Van Looyj). The quotation is from Euripides’ *Ino*. As it is quoted by Philodemus, the point of the quotation, which is made in the lines following after the one quoted here, is not made explicitly clear. In Stobaeus the fragment as a whole runs as follows: “As for tyrants having grown powerful after a long period of time, you see how small (are) the things that cause their downfall, and how one day brings some things down from on high, and lifts other things up high. Wealth has wings: for those who had it once I see falling on their back against their expectations.” See Knögel 1933, 12³.

⁸ In view of the example of Dio in ll. 18–24, the point appears to be that one should remember one’s own reaction in encountering insolent behavior in someone else, especially if one has oneself been in a situation similar to this person. With

lippson 1912, 392 4–5 [ἀεὶ προσλα]μβάνειν Delattre 6 [ἐτ]-
 ε[ροκλι]νές Jensen²: [ἀν]ε[πί]φ[α]νες Philippson 1912, 392 7–8
 -φο[ν· καί] [ἐ]πὶ πάγου πολ[ρε]υομένους Jensen²: -φο[ν ἀντ]ιφάρ-
 μ[α]κο[ν] | φερόμενους Philippson 1912, 392: -φο[ν μάλ]ιστα το[ῦ]το
 | φερόμενους Delattre 8–9 -δο]ν [λέ]γε[ι]ν, ὃ καὶ Δ- Jensen²: -δο]ν
 [ὃ] | τῶι [υῖῶ]ι Δ- Philippson 1912, 392 11–17 Jensen 11–13
 ὀρᾷς [.....] ἀ μακρῶ[.....] PCairo 126 12–13 ἡσκημένους
 Stobaei S: ἡσκημένους Stobaei MA: ἀνξηθέντας Philostr. 13–14
 ἐναρ[γῶς], ὅ[ν] τ[ρό]πον α[ὐ]τὸς Jensen² 15 διετ[έθη] πρὸς[ς]
 Jensen² 16 -σαντα [καί] ἀ [δ]ιὰ Jensen² 17 -[ς γ]εν[ικ]ώτερ[ον]
 Jensen²: -[ς ὡς] ὁ ν[ε]ώτερ[ος] Philippson 1912, 392: -[ς ἔνεκ]εν
 (Tsouna) ὅπερ (Delattre) [καί] (Tsouna) 18–9 Sauppe 19
 [Πτο]ιόδωρον <ἐλθῶν> Jensen, om. Jensen² 20 Μεγαρέα [ἐλθῶν
 χ]ρόνον Sauppe, Delattre ([ἐλθῶν (καί) χ]- Tsouna): [ὃς πολὺν χ]ρόνον
 Wehrli 22 Sauppe 25 ἐπιστάνη: sc. τὴν γνώμην sive τὴν διάνοιαν
 cf. e.g. Plb. 10.47.8 28 δύναται· † κουφίζε[ιν]: “videtur aliquid
 deesse e.g. (τὸ γὰρ) κ.” Jensen 27–9 μεῖ[ζ]ον, [ἀλλ·] ἀπ[ο]σπᾶν ὅ
 τι δύναται, κουφίζε[ιν] | τῆς ισχνότητος πεφυκ[ότα] (πεφυκ[υίας
 Wehrli) Sauppe (“sed proloqui decet quae abstrahere possint ab istis
 cogitationibus, apta illa ad levandam animi abiectioem”), Wehrli:
 μεῖ[ζ]ον· [τὸ δ·] ἀπ[ο]σπᾶν, ὅτι δύναται, κουφίζε[ιν] τῆς ισχνότητος
 πεφυκ[έναι] (Jensen²) Knögel 1933, 15³ (cf. 73²) 30–3 Sauppe 33–
 4 μηδ[έ] τιν· ἐπι[νοεῖν] εἴα τάγαθὰ Sauppe: μηδ[ενὸς] ἐπι[νοεῖν]
 ἄξι]α Philippson 1912, 393

21c Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 12.1–36 (BT 20 –
 2 Jensen)

κον ὀστῶι
 λ τὸν δι-
 [ἀ] τὴν ιασμον
 13III W καὶ π[αραμετρεῖ]ν ἑαυτὸν μὴ
 5 [πρὸς] τ[οὺς] π[εν]εστέρους [ἀλ-]
 [λὰ πρ]ὸς τοὺς καθ' ἕκαστον
 [εἶδο]ς ὑπερέχοντας, ἐπειδὴ
 [τὸ μ]ὲν ἐξαίρει, τὸ δὲ συστέλ-
 λ[ει], τοῦτο μὲν ἐπ' ἀ[γρ]ῶν
 10 κ[τήσ]εως, τοῦτο δ' ἐπ' ἀρχῆς
 κ[αὶ β]ασιλε[ί]ας [π]όλεων καὶ ἐ-
 θνῶ[ν· παρυ]πομιμν[ήσ]κ[ε-]
 [σθαι δὲ] καὶ τοῦ συναντᾶν [εἰ-]
 ωθότος φθόνου τοῖς ὑπερ[η-]
 15 φανούσιν, [ὃς ὁ] φθαλμία τίς

Jensen's new supplements, the text in ll. 13–18 would run as follows: "And that one is to remember clearly into what state of mind one was brought in relation to the insolent behavior of another person, and also what he himself by means of the example writes in more generic terms." Knögel assumes that the text of Aristo as summarized by Philodemus is a "Form der Selbstbetrachtung," i.e., Aristo is speaking about himself.

⁹ Dio (ca. 408–354 BC), who became both brother-in-law and son-in-law of Dionysius I (cp. n. 4) and went into exile to Athens in 366. In responding to the insolent behavior of Ptoiodorus of Megara, at whose door he was waiting for admission amongst a crowd of other visitors, Dio is referring to his own former position as tyrant in Syracuse ("over there"). The anecdote is told in full detail by Plutarch in his *Life of Dio* 17.9–10. See Jensen 1911, 400.

¹⁰ Rather than "And when one stands upon the gifts of good fortune" (Tsouna).

¹¹ The text appears to be corrupt. The point appears to be that the best way to relieve the feeling of being "reduced in circumstances" is to detract as much as possible from one's former good fortune, certainly not to magnify it; cp. Knögel 1933, 15³, where he renders his reading of the text with "wenn man sie aber möglichst verkleinere, so erleichtere man sich dadurch das drückende Bewusstsein der eigenen Dürftigkeit."

¹² The point appears to be that one should not focus on the good things until one has eliminated overconfidence.

21c Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 12.1–36 (BT 20–2 Jensen)¹

...² and (Aristo says that one is) to measure oneself³ not against those who are poorer but against those who are superior in each respect, since the former lifts up, and the latter makes (one) contract sail, (a measurement that is made) partly on the basis of possession of lands, partly on the basis of rule and kingship over cities and peoples. (Aristo says that one is) also to keep³ at the back of one's mind the envy which the arrogant typically encounter, which is a sort of eye-disease of the soul, so that just as the brightly adorned mantle of those one meets irritates the eyes (but in a duller

- [ἐστι]ν ψυχῆς, ὥστε καθάπερ
 [τ]οὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἢ τῶν συν-
 [α]ντώντων γεγ[α]νωμένη χλα-
 [ν]ίς ἐνοχλεῖ, κωφότερον δ' ἢ-
 20 περ ἐὰν παριῶν καὶ ἀναβαλ-
 λόμενος διατινάξῃ, παρα-
 πλησίως καὶ τὸν φθονερὸν
 λυπεῖ μὲν τάλλότρια τῶν ἀ-
 γαθῶν, οὐχ οὕτω δ' ὥσπερ ὅταν
 25 οἱ[ο]ν ἀναπτ[ε]ρυ[γί]ζοντά τινα
 καταμάθῃ δι' αὐτ[ᾶ] κ[α]ὶ πρὸς ὕ-
 ψος ἐξαιρόμ[εν]ον· τὸ[τ]ε δὲ προσ-
 φὺς ἔδακεν· ὅσαι [δ'] ἀπώλει-
 αι διὰ φθόνον γίνονται, βλέ-
 30 πεται τοῖς ἅπασιν.— ἐννοεῖν
 δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐπιχαιρεκακίαν,
 ὅταν εἰς ἀτυχίαν μεταπέσῃ·
 λυπηρὰ γάρ, ἅτε συ[ν]επιτιθ[ε]μέ-
 νων εὐλόγως τῶι τῆς τύχ[ης]
 35 π(τ)αίσματι τῶν πολλῶν [κ]α-
 τ' ἐχθρῶν ὁμολογουμένων θε-

[*vid. ad 21a*] 7 ὑπερέχοντας: cf. Knögel 1933, 22 14–15 φθό-
 νου—[ὁ]φθαλμία τις: cf. *Plu., de inv. et od.* 2 537A et Knögel 1933, 58
 17–19 τοὺς—ἐνοχλεῖ: cf. *Dem.* 36.45 18–19 χλα[ν]ίς: cf. *Plu.,*
Demetr. 41.7 20–1 ἀναβαλλόμενος: cf. *Pl., Thet.* 175E6–7 25
 ἀναπτ[ε]ρυ[γί]ζοντα: cf. *Ael., NA* 4.30 et Knögel 1933, 66–7 27–8
 προσφὺς: cf. *Hom. Il.* 24.212–3 31 ἐπιχαιρεκακίαν: cf. *Arist., EN*
1107a10–11 et 1108b1–6; Plu., De cur. 6 518C; *D.L.* 7.114 et Knögel
 1933, 70

[*vid. ad 21a*] 2–3 [φεύγειν] τὸν δι[ᾶ] τὴν [πενίαν χλε]υασμὸν *Phi-*
lippson 1912,393 3 αςμον *NO* 4 *Jensen*: καὶ [μετρέιν] *Hartung*
 5–6 *Hartung* 7–9 *Sauppe* 9 ἐπ' ἀ[γρ]ῶν *Jensen*: ἐπατ[.]ων *NO*:
 ἐπατ[.]ων *Sauppe* 10 κ[τῆς]εως *Jensen*: κ[ρατ]ε[ρ]ῶς *Sauppe*
 “*parum placet*” 10–28 “*horum versuum magna pars exstat in frgm.*
in marg. des.” *Jensen*; *vid. ad 21a et Jensen p. XI–XII* 11 *Sauppe*
 11–13 *Jensen*: ἐθνω[ν] πολλ[ῶν] ἀναμ[ι]ν[ή]σ[κ]ων ὀλέθρου *Sauppe,*
sed de πολλῶν vid. Jensen 18 γεγενομένη *N (sed vid. Jensen)*: ὠμενη
O: στελλομένη *Sauppe*; cf. *Phld., Mort.* 13.10–11 ὥστε γεγνωμένος
 ἀπέρχεσθαι 18–19 χλα[ν]ίς *Sauppe* 19 κωφότερον: “*in frgm.*
legitur κω et in pap. φ]οτερον” *Jensen*: κοινότερον *N*: ὡτερον *O* 29–
 →

manner than if in passing by [the other] throws it over the shoulder and gives it a thorough shake), similarly also the good things that belong to other people cause the envious person pain, but not in such a way as when he (the envious person) perceives someone as it were taking wing on account of them and rising aloft; in that case (the envious person) puts in his claws and bites. How many cases of ruin result from envy is seen by all. — (Aristo says that one is) to keep³ in mind also the delight in the misfortunes of another, when he (the arrogant person) falls (from good) into bad luck. For this is painful, since understandably most people are apt to press the advantage caused by the tripping up by fortune against acknowledged enemies . . .

¹ See **21a** n. 1.

² Philippon's supplement in ll. 2–3 would give: “. . . to flee the mockery due to poverty.”

³ For the use of the infinitive, see **21a** n. 7.

21d Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 13.1–38 (BT 22–4 Jensen)

13IV W ωστ φερ
 οντ . φιλω ε . ελές
 όν, ὅτι τῆς πρότερον ὑπερηφα-
 νίας ἀν[ε]μίμνησεν · διὸ
 5 καὶ φα[σ]ιν ἀχθόμενον αὐτὸν
 ἐπὶ τῷ σχεδὸν πάντας ἐπι-
 χαίρειν πρὸς Ἀρχέλαον [ἀπ]ελ-
 θεῖν. — παρατιθέναι δὲ καὶ τοὺς
 ἐν ὑπεροχαῖς μεγάλας ὡς
 10 συνιστᾶσιν αὐτούς, ὅταν ἴσοι
 καὶ συνεσταλμένοι φαίνων-
 ται κατὰ τὴν ὁμιλία[ν] καὶ
 καθάπερ ἐξ ἐναντίας ἰστά-
 μενοι τῷ τῆς τύχης ὄγκῳ,
 15 τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον, ὃς ἐπὶ τὸν
 αὐτο[ῦ] θρόνον ἐκάθισεν τὸν ῥι-
 γοῦντα Μακεδόνα πυρὸς πα-
 ρακειμένου, καὶ Διονύσιον,
 ὃς πρὸς τὸν “οἰμώξῃ Διονύσιε”
 20 φήσαντα, “σὺ μὲν οὖν,” [ἀπήν]τη-
 σεν, “εἰ μὴ τὸ ἡμῖσιν τῆς [ὑπο]θή-
 κης ἐπανόσεις” · καὶ [το]ὺς ἄλ-
 λους τοὺς ἀνθρ[ώποις πρᾶ]ως
 διὰ λόγων ἢ ἔργων ὁμιλήσαν-
 25 τας · καὶ πάλι τοὺς ἐναντίως
 δι’ ἐν ῥῆμα βαρὺ δυσχέρειαν
 ἐπισπασαμέ[ν]ους, ὡς Δημήτρι-
 ον, ὅτε Μακε[δ]όνες[ς] ἀπο[λιπ]όν-
 τες αὐτὸν πρὸς Π[ύρρον μ]ετέ-
 30 στησαν. — ἐννοεῖν δὲ καί, διό-
 τι μικροπρεπὲς ἐμ[φ]αίνεται
 τὸν πεπεισμένον ἄδρὸν εἶναι
 τὸ πρὸς πάντας ὑπε[ρη]φανεύ-
 εσθαι · παρα[π]λήσ[ιον γ]άρ ἐστιν
 35 ἐκ παραδόξο[υ] τετ[υχό]τα τῆς
 εὐκληρίας ὁθεν[οῦν] με[γ]α-

21d Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 13.1–38 (BT 22–4 Jensen)¹

. . . that/because he called to mind the previous arrogance. Actually, that is the reason why they say that he, being grieved that just about everyone rejoiced (at his misfortune), went away to Archelaus.² — (Aristo says that one is) also to bring to mind³ those in positions of great superiority, how they comport themselves, whenever they appear equal and unpretentious in their social dealings and as it were adopting a stance opposite to the pomposity that usually accompanies (good) fortune: Alexander, who made the Macedonian who was shivering with cold sit down on his own throne with a fire (burning) beside him; and Dionysius, who in response to the person who had said, “You will rue it, Dionysius,” replied, “Rather you will, if you don’t bring/take back half of the deposit/suggestion”;⁴ and also the others who have dealt mildly with people in word and deed; and on the other hand again, those who conversely by a single harsh word have brought down vexation on themselves, as Demetrius (did), when the Macedonians deserted him and went over to the side of Pyrrhus.⁵ — (Aristo says that one is) to keep in mind³ also that it is a manifest sign of petty-mindedness for the person who is convinced that he is very important to behave arrogantly towards everybody.⁶ For that is nearly the same thing as, when one has unexpectedly hit upon some good fortune from whatever source, to avoid, by pretending greatness of soul, giving the impression of being overly pleased.

[λο]ψυχ[ί]αν ὑποκρινόμενο[ν μὴ]
σ[φ]όδρα δοκεῖν ἐπευφραίνεσθαι

[vid. ad **21a**] 3–8 “agitur de Euripide” Jensen; cf. *Vitam Euripidis* 3 (3.20–4.1 Schwartz); *Thom. Mag., Vit. Eur.* (140.29–33 Westermann); *Satyr., Vit. Eur. F* 39 col. 15.20–34 et 17.19–25 15–18 cf. *Curt.* 8.4.15; *Frontin., Strat.* 4.6.3; *Val. Max.* 5.1 ext. 1 18–22 cf. **21b**.9–13 et *Plu., Reg. et imp. apophth.* 175C–176C (cf. 175C πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα “μωρολογήσεις Διονύσιε” “μοναρχήσω μὲν οὖν” εἶπε) 27–30 de *Pyrrho ac Demetrio* vid. *Plu., Demetr.* 41.5 et *Pyrrh.* 11.9 30–8 cf. **21f**.22–33

[vid. ad **21a**] 2 οντ[.]φιλω[.....]ε[.]ε N: οντ[.]φιλωτο[.....]ε[.]τελες O: οντ[.]φιλωτο[.....]ε[.]ελες Jensen || εὐτ[ελες] Sauppe 21–2 τη[....]θη NO: της[....]θη Jensen: *spatio longius* [κατα]θήκης Sauppe: [ἐν]θήκης Sedley 23 Sauppe 28 Caterino 29–30 [μ]ετέστησαν Cobet 1874, 30: ἀπέστησαν Sauppe 35 τετ[υχό]τα Jensen; de *perfecto* vid. Crönert, *MGH* 279–80: τ[υχόν]τα τι[νός] Ussing 36 οθεν[....]με N: ονεν[....]με O: οθεν[....]με Jensen: ὀθεν[περ] με- Delattre 37–8 [μὴ] | σ[φ]όδρα Ussing: σ[φ]όδρα Sauppe

21e Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 14.1–40 (BT 24–6 Jensen)

13V W μιμνήσκοντ[ες καὶ]
λοιδοροῦντες. — παρυπομιμνή-
σκειν δὲ καὶ [το]ῦ περὶ τὰς π[ρά-
ξ]εις ἀμαρτ[ω]λοῦ τῶν μόνων,
5 ἐπιτευκτικοῦ δὲ τῶν συνερ-
γουμένων ὑφ’ ἐνός καὶ πλει-
όνων · ὁ γὰρ ὑπερήφανος οὐ-
τε συνπαραληπτικὸς ἐτέρων,
ἅμα μὲν ὑπ’ οἰήσεως, ἅμα δὲ
10 διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερφρ[ο-]

¹ See **21a** n. 1.

² This appears to be an instance of the effects on a person of ἐπιχαιρεκάρκία evinced by others (see **21c**. 30–2), i.e. of someone who has fallen into bad luck taking offence at being reminded by others of his previous arrogance, and leaving Athens as a result. Cobet 1874, 29 was the first to suggest that Euripides is being referred to here. See Jensen 1911, 401 and Wehrli p. 57.

³ For the use of the infinitive, see **21a** n. 7.

⁴ Dionysius I (ca. 423–367 BC), tyrant of Syracuse. Unfortunately the precise meaning of Dionysius' response to what evidently is someone's warning is not clear. Matters are complicated by the fact that the reading of the papyrus is not certain. According to Jensen there is not enough space for the reading [κατα]θήκης of Sauppe, which carries a distinctly financial connotation in the sense of "deposit"; cp. Sauppe 1853, 21 and Ussing 1868, 163. Jensen's own reading [ὑπο]θήκης is less unequivocal: "pledge, deposit" or "suggestion, warning"? Tsouna translates with "you will, if you will not take back half of your warning," which has the advantage of making Dionysius funny and gracious.

Tsouna mentions a tentative suggestion made by D.N. Sedley to read [ἐν]θήκης which would give "if you don't invest half of your capital." On this anecdote, see Jensen 1911, 402.

⁵ The "single harsh word" is not known. On the difference between Demetrius (Demetrius Poliorcetes ca. 337–283 BC) and Pyrrhus (king of Epirus, 319–272 BC), see Plutarch, *Life of Demetrius* 41.5 and *Life of Pyrrhus* 11.9.

⁶ The translation follows Knögel 1933, 71 in taking τὸ πρὸς πάντας ὑπερφηφανεύεσθαι to be an articular infinitive (subject of μικροπρεπὲς ἐμ[φ]αίνεται), although the position of the article τό is peculiar (cp. Knögel 1933, 21¹). Ussing 1868, 164 takes the phrase τὸ πρὸς πάντας with ἄδρὸν εἶναι "that he is a very important person in comparison to all (others)."

21e Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 14.1–40 (BT 24–6 Jensen)¹

. . . calling to mind and abusing. — (Aristo says that one is) to bear in mind² also that people who go it alone are prone to failure in their actions, and that people who let themselves be assisted by one or more others are likely to succeed. For the arrogant person tends not to call in the help of others, partly from self-conceit, partly because he looks down on the others, and if he does call (them) in for help, he finds it difficult to heed advice, both because

- νεῖν, ἄν τε παρακαλῇ, χαλε-
 πὸς ὑπακούειν διὰ τε τὴν
 ἄλλην ἀηδίαν καὶ διὰ τὸ τὰς
 πράξεις ἐξιδ[ι]άζε[σθ]αι θέλειν,
 15 εἴτ' ἀσυνέργη[τ]ος ὦν· πολ-
 λούς δὲ τοὺς π[α]ρατηροῦ[ν]τας
 καὶ ὑποσκελίζοντας συνηρ[α-]
 νικῶς κατὰ λόγον διαπίπ[τει],
 κᾶπειτα κουφίζεται τῆς ὑπερ-
 20 ηφανίας, ἐπεὶ διὰ τῶν λόγων
 οὐ βούλεται, διὰ τῶν ἀποτεύ-
 ξων· διὸ κὰν τοῖς δικαστηρί-
 οῖς καὶ τοῖς ἀγῶσιν ἐλαττοῦν-
 ται. Τιμοκρέων γοῦν ὁ [Ῥόδ]ι-
 25 ος ὑπερήφανος ὦν, πρὸς [μὲ]ν τὸ [ν]
 ὅτ' εἰσή[ι]ει πυνθανόμενον πο-
 ταπὸς ἐστίν, “τοῦ κήρυκο[ς]” εἰ-
 πεν “ἀκούσει μικρὸν ὕσ[τ]ε[ρο]ν”· [δι-]
 αδοθέντος δὲ τοῦ λε[χ]θέντος
 30 οὕτως ἀντέκοψε τοῖς θεωροῦ-
 σιν, ὥστε τὸν βραβε[υ]τὴν ἐκ[τεί]-
 νοντ' αὐτ[ῶ]ι τὴν ῥάβδον αἶδο[ντι]
 καστ[ό]ρειον μικροῦ καταπ[α]ῦσαι·
 διόπερ ἡττημ[έ]νος, ὅτ' ἐξή[ι]ει
 35 ταῦτοῦ “ποτα[πό]ς” ἐπερωτῶ[ν]τος, “Σε-
 ρίφιος” ἀπήντ[η]σεν]. — λογίζεσθαι
 δὲ καί, διότι [τὴν] λαμπρὰν τύ-
 χην ἀποδ[εδυ]μ[έ]νος καθαι-
 ρή[σει] φρόνημα καὶ [ἐ]ν ταπει-
 40 νοτ[ά]τηι περιστάσει φανεῖται . . .

[vid. ad 21a] 13 ἀηδίαν: cf. col. 8.1–5 24–36 papyrus denuo
 inspexit M. Gigante CERC 7 (1977) 42, quem sequimur 24 Τιμοκρέων
 . . . [ὁ Ῥόδ]ιος: RE VIA.1 (1936) 1271–3; DNP 12.1 (2002) 587 33
 καστ[ό]ρειον: cf. Pi., P. 2.69; I. 1.16; Plu., Lyc. 22.4; Poll. 4.78 35–
 6 de Seripho cf. Pl., Resp. 1 329E7–330A3

[vid. ad 21a; columnarum 14 (21e) et 15 (21f) inter se locos commu-
 tavit Sauppe, quia “sententiarum rationes necessitate quadam hoc fla-
 gitare videbantur” (1853, 10–11); 24–36 cf. Wilamowitz, Sappho und

he is hard to please anyway and especially on account of wishing to claim the actions as his own, thus being impossible to cooperate with.³ And having gathered a large collection of⁴ people who watch him closely and are eager to trip him up, he falls flat, as is to be expected, and then he is relieved of his arrogance through his failures, because he is unwilling to be (relieved) by the words (of those around him). That is the reason why in lawcourts and contests too they (arrogant people) are defeated. Timocreon of Rhodes, in any case, being arrogant, said to the person who—when he (Timocreon) was entering (for the contest)—asked him where he was from, “You will hear from the herald a little later.” His answer having been spread around, he had so much antagonized the spectators that the referee almost made him stop by extending to him his staff while he was singing a *castoreion*.⁵ For that very reason, when he went out defeated and the same person asked him again “Where are you from?,” he answered “From Seriphus.”⁶—(Aristo says that one is) also to reckon² with the fact that, once divested of his splendid (good) fortune, he (the arrogant person) will have to lower his pride and will find himself in circumstances of the utmost lowliness . . .

¹ See **21a** n. 1. On column 14, see Jensen 1911, 402–3.

² For the use of the infinitive, see **21a** n. 7.

³ Rather than “and then is left unassisted” (Tsouna) and “und nachher steht er dann hilflos da” (Jensen 1911, 403).

⁴ The verb used here (συνεργαρίζειν) has a distinctly financial connotation in the sense that he “has gathered a large capital” of potential enemies.

⁵ A *castoreion* is a melody named after Castor, which was accompanied by the *aulos* and sung by the Spartans while marching into battle. Castor being associated with horses, it is also used in the context of a victorysong for horseraces (Pindar *Pythian* 2.69).

⁶ This anecdote is explained by Wilamowitz, *Sappho and Simonides*, 1913, 146–72. While entering the theater for a contest, the famous poet Timocreon of Rhodes (early 5th century B.C.) was asked by a stranger where he came from. Timocreon answered “You’ll hear soon enough, when the herald announces my victory.” This overconfident and arrogant answer spread through the crowd of spectators with the result that Timocreon did not win the contest. When Timocreon left the theatre, he was accosted by the same person with the same question and answered “From Seriphus,” referring to the most miserable of the Cyclades, notorious for its poverty, and apparently shorthand for a total lack of renown (cp. the anecdote about Themistocles, told in the *Republic* of Plato 1 329E). This explanation entails reading in l. 24 “[the Rhod]ian,” as proposed by

Simonides, 1913, 146–72] 11–12 χαλεπῶς *N*: χαλεπῶ[.] *O*, *Jensen*: χαλεπός *Sauppe* “*cum particula quae est te haec coniungantur cum eo quod praecedit* οὔτε συμπαραληπτικός” 15 ἄσυνεργη[τ(ικ)]ός *Sauppe* 24 [ὁ ‘Ρόδ]ιος *Wilamowitz, Jensen ap. Wilamowitz*: γουν[.....]ι *NO*: γουν[ς .ρ]ιφι *Jensen*: *spatio longius* [ὁ Σερίφ]ιος *Sauppe* 25 προ[...ντ[...]] *N*: προς[...ντο[...]] *O*, *Jensen*: πρὸ[ς τό]ν γε *Sauppe* 26 οτιεῖς *NO*, *Jensen*: ὅτε εἰσήει *Sauppe*: ὅτ’ εἰσήει *Hartung*; cf. 34 28–9 [δι]αδοθέντος *Caterino*: [ἀν]αδοθέντος *Ussing*: [παρ]αδοθέντος *Sauppe* 29 *Cobet 1874, 30 –I, coll. Val. Max. 7.5.2* 31–2 βραβε[υτήν ἐκ]τείνοντ’ *Caterino*: [ἐπι]τείνοντ’ *Sauppe*: [ἐν]τείνοντ’ *Wilamowitz*: [δια]τείνοντ’ *Gigante, coll. D.L. 2.48* 32–3 *Sauppe* 36 *Sauppe* 38 ἀποδ[εδυμ]έ[νος] *Sudhaus ap. Jensen*: ἀπλ[...λ[...]]λε[...]] *legit Jensen* 39 *spatio longius* –ρή[σει τὸ] φρόνημα *Sauppe* || κα[...]]τα *N*: κα[...]]ντα *O*: κα[...]]ντα *Jensen*: κὰν τῇ τα- *Sauppe* 40 νωτ- *NO*: corr. *Sauppe*

21f Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 15.1–40 (BT 26–8 Jensen)

13VIW ...δο.....
 φων συντε.....οις [οὐ-]
 δὲ δι’ ὧν προσήκει, [τ]ὸ δὲ καὶ ἐ-
 πὶ τοῖς μὴ π[ρὸς] ἡμᾶς ἀτιμάζει·
 5 καὶ νῆ Δί’ ὥς ἄδικον διὰ τοῦ ταπει-
 νοῦν ἐτέρους ἑαυτὸν μετεωρί-
 ζειν, ἀλλὰ μὴ διὰ τῆς οἰκείας
 ὑπεροχῆς· διὸ καὶ Λύσανδρος
 Ἀγησιλάῳ καταστ[ή]σαντι
 10 κρεωδαίτην ἑαυτὸ[ν] “ἡπίστα-
 σό γε σὺ τοὺς φίλους” εἶπεν “ἐλάτ-
 τους ποιεῖν.” — καὶ πολλάκις ἑαυ-
 τὸν ἐπερωτᾶν· “τί με [τὸ] γαυρι-
 ᾶν ποιοῦν καὶ ὑπερηφανεῖν;
 15 ὅτι κερμάτια κέκτημαι πλεί-
 ονα; ἀλλ’ ὅτι ν[ομ]ί[ζω]μαι τῶν
 εὐγενῶν ἥτοι στρ[α]τηγούν-
 των καὶ τιμωμένω[ν] ἐνιαυ-
 σίαι περιβολῇι χλαμύδος;” εὐρή-
 20 σει γὰρ ταπεινὸν ἕκαστον καὶ
 τὴν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ καύχησιν ἀνά-
 γωγον. — καὶ διαιρεῖν μεγαλο-

Wilamowitz, instead of “[Seriph]ian,” as read by Jensen in his text; Wilamowitz reports that Jensen accepted this reading.

21f Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 15.1–40 (BT 26–8 Jensen)¹

...² and not by means of what is appropriate; on the other hand³ he (the arrogant person) treats (people) with disdain even on account of the things that have nothing to do with us. And by Zeus, how unjust (it is)⁴ to elevate oneself by bringing others down, and not through one’s own superiority. That is in fact the reason why Lysander said to Agesilaus, when he had made himself (Lysander) meat-carver, “You certainly knew how to make your friends inferior.”⁵ — And (Aristo says that one is) to ask oneself⁶ many times: “What is it that makes me prance like a horse and be arrogant? Because I possess more cash? Or is it because I am held to belong to the well-born or to those who are generals and are honored by an annual investiture of a military mantle?” For he will find each (of these reasons to be) of little value and any boasting about them ill-bred. — And (Aristo says that one is) to distinguish⁶ greatness of soul from arrogance, and not to lump them together as one and the

ψυχίαν ὑπερηφα[ν]ίας, ἀλλὰ μὴ
 συμφύρειν ὥς ἐν καὶ ταυτόν· διαφ[έ-]
 25 ρει γὰρ ὅσον καὶ [έ]πὶ τοῦ σώματος
 οἰδήσεως εὐεξία, καὶ ἔστιν τοῦ
 μὲν μεγαλοψ[ύ]χου τὸ καταφρο-
 νεῖν τῶν τυχη[ρ]ῶν ὑπερέχον-
 τα τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄγκῳ, τοῦ δ' ὑ-
 30 περηφάνου τὸ διὰ κουφότητα
 ταύτης ἐκπνευματούμενον
 ὑπὸ κτήσεως ὑπερορᾶν ἐτέ-
 ρους. — καὶ λογίζεσθαι, διότι ζῶ-
 α μὲ[ν ο]ὐκ ἀτιμάζει τὰ τυχόν-
 35 τα σ[υντ]ρεφόμενος αὐ[τ]οῖς, οἵ-
 ον ἴ[ππο]ις καὶ κ[υ]σὶν καὶ τοῖς
 ὁμοίοις, ἄνθρωπον δὲ τὸ τηλι-
 κούτῳ διαφέρον καὶ συμφυ-
 λότατον αὐτῷ, διότι κεκόσ-
 40 [μηται . . .]

[vid. ad **21a**] 8–12 *Plu.*, *Lys.* 23.11–12 (“ἡ καλῶς ἦδεις, ὦ Ἀγη-
 σίλαε, φίλους ἐλαττοῦν”) *et Ages.* 8.1–2 (“ἦδεις ἄρα σαφῶς ὦ Ἀγη-
 σίλαε φίλους ἐλαττοῦν”); *Xen.*, *Hell.* 3.4,9 (“ὦ Ἀγησίλαε, μειοῦν μὲν
 ἄρα σύ γε τοὺς φίλους ἡπίστω”); cf. *etiam Plu.*, *Quaest. conviv.* 2.10
 644B *et Praec. ger. rep.* 11 805F 22–33 cf. **21d**.30–8 31 ἐκπνευ-
 ματούμενον: cf. *Knögel* 1933, 59²

[vid. ad **21a et 21e**] 1–3 [οὐχ ὁρῶν, ἀ]φ' ὧν συντε[λεῖν αὐτ]οῖς
 [οὐ]δὲ δι' ὧν προσήκει *Philippson* 1912, 393 2 [..]ον[.]υντε *N*:
 φ[.]ονξυντε *O* 3 ηκε[.]οδε *N*: ητει[.]οδε *O*: -ήκει, ὁ δὲ *Sauppe*, *Wehrli*
 7 ἀλλὰ μὴ *Sauppe*: ἀλλαδη *N*: ἀλλαιδη *O* 16 σ[τ].....]μαι *N*:
 σιν[.]ιζ[.]μαι *O*: ὅτι [γεγένη]μαι *Sauppe* 22–35 “*horum versuum*
pars maior exstat in frgm. a Neap. design.” *Jensen*; vid. ad **21a et Jensen**
p. XI–XII 24 ταυτό[ν] *Gigante* 1996c, coll. **21o**.3 35 μεν[.]αυ[.]οις
N: με[.....]ς *O*: vocαυ[τ] “*legitur in frgm. in marg. des.*” *Jensen*: σ[υν-
 τ]ρεφόμεν[α ἐ]αυ[τ]οῖς *Sauppe* (cf. *Wehrli*) 40 *Sauppe*: -[μηται λόγῳ]
Tsouma: -[μηται νῶ τε καὶ λόγῳ] *Knögel* 1933, 41¹

21g Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 16.1–38 (BT 28–9
Jensen)

13VII W νται χρ[ονι-]
 σθείσ[η]ς [ὑπ]ερηφανίας. — καὶ φ[ο-]

same thing. For the difference is as great as in the case of the body physical well-being (differs) from bloatedness, and whereas it is characteristic of the magnanimous person to despise the gifts of fortune because he surpasses (them) by the solidity of his soul, it is characteristic of the arrogant person to look down on others because, through the flimsiness of his soul, he is inflated by possession(s). — And (Aristo says that one is) to take into account⁶ that whereas (the arrogant person) does not treat living beings, whatever they are, with disdain, being bred and fed with them as he is, such as horses and dogs and the like, he (does so) in the case of man, the (being) that differs so much (from animals) and is most nearly related to himself, because it is adorned . . .⁶

¹ See **21a** n. 1.

² Philipsson's supplement of ll. 1–3 appears to mean “not seeing from what source nor by what means it fits them to bring into effect.”

³ This is an attempt to render Jensen's reading [τ]ὸ δὲ, which would seem to imply that the arrogant person is subject of the preceding clause too. Editors generally read ὁ δὲ, which clearly refers to the arrogant person as opposed to another type of person mentioned in the preceding clause.

⁴ This clause apparently depends on a verb of the type “(one is) to keep in mind,” which occurred in the part of the column which has now been lost.

⁵ Lysander, who had been a lover of Agesilaus, had successfully supported Agesilaus in laying claim to the Spartan kingship in 400 B.C., and had also been instrumental in getting Agesilaus appointed commander-in-chief in an expedition against the Persians in 396 B.C. However, as soon as they were in Asia, Agesilaus grew envious of Lysander on account of his popularity, and instead of giving him a command appointed him meat-carver. On this anecdote about Lysander and Agesilaus, see the references in the upper *apparatus* and Jensen 1911, 403–4; Knögel 1933, 57² and cp. **27** n. 1.

⁶ For the use of the infinitive, see **21a** n. 7.

⁷ On ll. 33–9, see C. Gallavotti 1927, 476.

21g Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 16.1–38 (BT 28–9 Jensen)¹

. . . when arrogance has become chronic. — And (Aristo says that one is) to fear² the arrogant treatment (of oneself) by more people (who are) greater than oneself, which will happen quite

βεῖ[σθαι] τ[ῆ]ν ὑπὸ πλειόνων [αὐ-]
 τοῦ μειζόνων καθυπερηφ[α-]
 5 νίαν δικαιοτά[τ]α γενησομέ-
 νην, καὶ μ[ή]ποθ' οὐς ὑπερορᾷ
 τις ἐπὶ τ[οῦ] αὐτὸν ἢ τύχη
 ποιήσῃ [καταφε]ύγειν, ὃ γέγονε
 πολλάκις ἢ[δ]η καὶ πόλεσι
 10 καὶ ἀνθρώποις, οὐς εἰ μὲν ὁ-
 μοίους εὐρίσκοι, περιορῶτ' ἄν
 εὐλόγως, εἰ δὲ μετρίους, ὑπὸ
 τῆς ἐκείνων εὐγνωμοσύνης
 μᾶλλον ἀμαρτάνων ἐξελέγ-
 15 χοιτ' ἄν. — ἐννοε[ῖν] δ' [ὅτι] καὶ εἰς
 μωρίαν ἐν[ί]στε τοῦ νόσημα
 περι[ί]στησιν [ἢ] μανίαν, εἰ μὴ
 τὰ Ξέρξου τῶν δυεῖν οὐκ ἔχε-
 ται ἢ θάτερου, τὸ ζευγνύει[ν τ]ὸν
 20 Ἑλλήσποντον καὶ καθιέναι
 πέδας εἰς τὴν θάλατταν καὶ
 τᾶλλα ποιεῖν ἅ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέ-
 γουσιν · ἢ τὸ θεοὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώ-
 πων [έ]αυτοὺς γεγονέναι δο-
 25 κεῖν, καὶ τᾶλλ' ὅσα γίνεται πε-
 ρὶ τοὺς ἀνέδην ὑπερηφανοῦν-
 τας. — τοσαῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱκα-
 νὰ καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐπειπεῖν ·
 141 W ὁ δ' αὐθάδης λεγόμενος ἔοι-
 30 κε μὲν εἶναι μεικτὸς ἐξ οἴσε-
 ως καὶ ὑπερηφανίας καὶ ὑπερ-
 οψίας, μετέχων δὲ καὶ πολ-
 λῆς εἰκασιότητος. τοιοῦτο[ς]
 γάρ ἐστιν, φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων, ο[ἱ]-
 35 ος ἐν τῇ μάκραι θερμ[ὸ]ν [ἢ ψυ-]
 χρὸν αἰτεῖν μ[ὴ π]ροανακρ[ί]ν[α]ς
 τὸν συμβεβηκότ', εἰ καὶ κεί-
 [ν]ος συναρέσκει, καὶ — — —]

[vid. ad 21a] 15–37 vid. L. Spengel 1838, 1012–3 19–21 Hdt. 7.34–
 6 29 ὁ δ' αὐθάδης: cf. Thphr., Char. 15 Αὐθάδεια 31–2

justifiably (to one); and (fear) that at some time, fortune may make one take refuge with those whom one now scorns, something that has happened many times already to both cities and men; and, if one should find these people (to be) similar (to oneself), one should with good reason be ignored, but if (one should find them to be) moderate, then one should, by their very well-meaningness, all the more be proven to be in the wrong. — And (Aristo says that one) is to keep in mind² that the (mental) disease sometimes actually evolves into stupidity or madness, unless the deeds of Xerxes do not belong to both these two categories or either one of them — his bridging the Hellespont and hurling shackles into the sea and doing the other things which people tell about him; or people thinking that they themselves have become gods instead of men, and all the other things which happen in the case of those whose arrogance is without restraint.

This much, then, is enough to quote too about these matters/ persons.³

*The person said (to be) inconsiderate*⁴ seems to be a blend of conceit, arrogance, and disdain, along with a large dose of thoughtlessness. He is the kind, Aristo says, to demand hot or cold water in the bath without first asking his fellow-bather whether it is alright with him too, . . .

¹ See **21a** n. 1.

² For the use of the infinitive, see **21a** n. 7.

³ After this closing formula Philodemus proceeds in cols. 16.29–24.21 (**21g.29–21o.21**) to *quote* a number of character sketches by Aristo:

1. “the inconsiderate person” [αὐθάδης] 16.29–17.17 (**21g.29–21h.17**);
2. “the self-willed person” [αὐθέκαστος] 17.17–18.11 (**21h.17–21i.11**);
3. “the know-it-all” [παντειδήμων] 18.11–19.2 (**21i.11–21j.2**);
then follow some comments on the effects of these characters:
 1. “the inconsiderate person” 19.2–17 (**21j.2–17**);
 2. “the self-willed person” 19.17–20.3 (**21j.17–21k.3**);
 3. “the know-it-all” 20.3–32 (**21k.3–32**);
4. “the disdainful person” [ὑπερόπτης] 20.32–21.38 (**21k.32–21l.38**), i.e.
 - 4a. “the man affecting solemnity” [σεμνοκόπος] 21.4–14 (**21l.4–14**);
 - 4b. “the swaggerer” [βρενθυόμενος] 21.14–38 (**21l.14–38**);
5. “the ironic person” [εἴρων] 21.37–23.37 (**21l.38–21n.37**);
6. “the disparager” [εὐτελιστής] or “the utter disparager” [ἐξευτελιστής] and “the vilifier” [οὐδενωτής] or “the utter vilifier” [ἐξουδενωτής] 24.1–21 (**21o.1–24**).

ὑπερλωΐας: *vid. Knögel 1933, 20* 34 ὁ Ἀρίστων: *vid. ad 21a.10*
35–8 *Eup. F 490 PCG V*

[*vid. ad 21a*] 1–2 *Sauppe*: χρ[η]σθεῖς[η]ς [τῆς ὑπ]ερηφανίας
Caterino 3 [αὐ]τοῦ *Ussing*: [αὐ]τοῦ *Sauppe* 7 τις[....]ου *N*: τις[...]*ο*
O: τις ἐ[πὶ τ]οῦ[του]ς *Cobet 1874, 29*: τις εἰς τ]οῦ[του]ς *Sauppe* 8
[καταφε]ύγειν *Cobet 1874, 29 coll. col. 21k.28–9*: [καταφ]υγεῖν
Hartung: [ὑποφε]ύγειν *Sauppe* 15 ἐννοε[ῖν] δ[ί]οτι *Gigante 1996c,*
coll. col. 21d.30–1 18 Ξέρξου *Spengel*: ξειξου *NO*: ξε[.]ξου *Jensen*
24 [ἐ]αυτοὺς *Ussing*: αὐτοὺς *Spengel*: αὐτοὺς *Sauppe* 28 τούτων:
“*h.e. τῶν ὑπερηφανούντων*” *Sauppe* 32 “μετέχειν *concininitas*
sermonis requirere videtur” *Sauppe*; *cf. 21h.24* 34–5 ὁ [Χί]λος *Caterino*
35 μακραιθερ *NO*: μακρ[α].]θερμ *Jensen*: μακρᾶ θεραπεί[α] *Caterino,*
Spengel: μάκ(τ)ραι *Sauppe coll. Poll. 7.168*; *cf. Crönert, MGH, 86–7* ||
θερμ[ὸ]ν [ῆ ψυ]λχρὸν *Sauppe*: [ὥς αἰς]λχρὸν *Caterino* 36 *Sauppe* 37
συ(νε)μβεβηκότ’ *Kassel-Austin ad Eup. F 490 PCG V* 37–8 *Jensen*:
κάκει[ι]νος[...]*Sauppe*: κάκει[ι]νος ταὐτὸ θέλει *Ussing*: κάκει[ι]νω οὐτὸ
δοκεῖ *Cobet 1874, 31*

21h Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 17.1–36 (BT 29–31
Jensen)

- 14II W παῖδα πριάμενος μηδὲ το[ῦνο-]
[μ]α προσερωτῆσαι μήτ’ αὐ[τὸς]
θέσθαι, καλεῖν δὲ παῖδα [καὶ]
μηθὲν ἄλλο· καὶ τὸν συναλεί-
5 ψαντα μὴ ἀντισυναλείφειν·
καὶ ξενισθεῖς μ[ὴ] ἀντιξενίσαι·
καὶ θύραν ἀλλοτρίαν κό[π]των,
ἐπερωτήσαντος, τίς ἐστιν, μη-
δὲν ἀποκρίνεσθαι, μέχρι ἂν
10 ἐξέλθῃ· καὶ ἀρ[ρ]ωστοῦντ’ αὐ-
τὸν ἐπισκεπτομένου φίλου
μὴ λέγειν πῶς ἔχ[ει], μηδ’ αὐ-
τὸς ἐπι[σ]κεπτόμ[ενός] τινα τοι-
οὔτό τι προσεπ[ερ]ωτ[ῆσ]α[ι]· κ]αὶ
15 γρά[φ]ων ἐπιστολὴν τὸ “χαίρειν”
μὴ προσγράψαι μηδ’ “ἐρρώσθαι”
τελευταῖον. ὁ δ’ αὐθέκαστος
οὐ πάνυ μὲν εἰ[καῖ]ός ἐ[στ]ιν οὐ-
δ’ ἄλογος [ὥ]σπερ ὁ [α]ὐθάδης, δι’
20 οἷσιν δὲ τοῦ μόνος φρονεῖν

An English translation of this part is provided by Rusten. On the character sketches, see Pasquali 1918, 144–7; Gallavotti 1927; Knögel 1933, 16–40; Wehrli on F 14 p. 58–9; Diggle, *Characters* 9–10; Tsouna and Vogt in this volume.

Jensen 1911, 395–6 and Knögel 1933, 25 take the character types of the second part to be related to that of the “arrogant person” [ὑπερήφανος] of the first part in the sense of subspecies (“Untertypen”). Accordingly, the Philodemus text as a whole derives from one single work by Aristo on relieving arrogance. See also Dorandi, Ranocchia, and Tsouna in this volume. According to Wehrli (on F13–14 p. 53–5), the two parts of the text derive from two different sources: 1. a treatise by Aristo on relieving arrogance (cols. 10.10–16.28 [21a. 10–21g.28] = F 13I–VII Wehrli); 2. a number of character sketches in the style of the *Characters* of Theophrastus (cols. 16.29–24.21 [21g.29–21o.21] = F 14I–IX Wehrli), probably also by Aristo. His conclusion is accepted by Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 219–21.

⁴ On the “inconsiderate person” [αὐθάδης], see Knögel 1933, 26–28, Wehrli on F 14I–II p. 59–60 and Gigante 1997b, 345–7.

21h Philodemus, *On Vices 10*, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 17.1–36 (BT 29–31 Jensen)¹

. . . (the *inconsiderate* person is the kind), when he has bought a slave, not even to ask for his name nor to give him one himself, but to call him “boy” and nothing else. And (he is the kind) not to rub thoroughly with oil in return the person who has rubbed (him) thoroughly with oil. And (he is the kind) after he has been entertained as a guest, not to entertain (his host) as a guest in return. And (he is the kind) when he is knocking at another person’s door, after (that person) has asked “Who is it?,” not to give any answer until (that person) has come outside. And (he is the kind), when a friend checks on him while he is unwell, not to say how he is doing, nor when he himself checks on someone, to ask such a question. And (he is the kind) in writing a letter not to write (at the beginning) “Joy to you” or “Be well” at the end.²

The *self-willed* person³ is not quite so thoughtless and lacking

ἰδιογνωμονῶν καὶ πειθόμε-
 νος ἐν ἅπασιν κατορθώ[σ]ειν,
 ἀμαρτήσεσθαι δ', ἂν ἑτέρου κρί-
 σει προσχρήσῃται, μετέχων
 25 δὲ καὶ ὑπερηφανίας· οἷος μη-
 δενὶ προσαναθέμενος ἀπο-
 δημεῖν, ἀγοράζειν, πωλεῖν, ἀρ-
 χὴν μετιέναι, τᾶλλα συντε-
 λεῖν· κἂν προσερωτήσῃ τις, [τί]
 30 μέλλει ποιεῖν, “οἶδ' ἐγώ” λέγειν·
 κἂν μέμφοιταί τις, [ὕ]πομειδι-
 ῶν “ἐμὲ σύ;” καὶ παρακληθεῖς ἐ-
 πὶ συνεδρείαν βουλευομέν[ωι]
 μὴ βούλεσθαι τὸ δοκοῦν εἰπεῖν,
 35 εἰ μὴ τοῦτο μέλ[λ]ει πράττειν·
 καὶ πάντ' ἐν ὅσοις ἀποτέτευχε,

[vid. ad **21a**] 1–36 vid. L. Spengel 1838, 1013–4 11 ἐπισκεπτο-
 μένου: cf. Philemon ap. Stob., Anth. 4.36.6 (= F 47 PCG VII); Dem.
 9.12; Isoc. 19.25 15 cf. Thphr., Char. 24.13 (Ὑπερηφανία) et **25** 17
 αὐθάκαστος: cf. Arist., EN 1127a23–6; Str. 4.4.2 195, 28 C.; Plu., Lys.
 21.7 20–1 cf. Plu., Praec. ger. rep. 13 808D ἢ δ' αὐθάδεια, φησὶν ὁ
 Πλάτων (Ep. 4 321 C 1), ἐρημία σύνοικος 32–3 cf. [Pl.], Sis. 387B7–
 C3

[vid. ad **21a**] 1 μήτε Sauppe 1–2 Spengel 2 Sauppe: α[ὐτῶι]
 Spengel 8 ἐπερωτώμενος Spengel; cf. Diggle ad Thphr., Char. 14.7 p.
 336–7 12 ἔ[χει] Sauppe: ἔ[χεις] Caterino, Spengel 13–4 Caterino
 16 προ[σ]γράψαι Jensen ap. Knögel 23–4¹, coll. Luc., Laps. 5; cf.
 Diggle, Characters 10 18 Caterino 20 δ[ὲ τ]οῦ μόνος Sauppe:
 δ[.]ουμένος N: δ[.]ουμονοε O: δ[.]ουμονος Jensen: δ' ἡγούμενος
 Spengel: δὲ ἡγούμενος Ussing 26 προσαναθέμενος: cf. **21i.8** et vid.
 Knögel 1933, 65² 29 τις, τί Sauppe: τισὶ VH, N²: τις O: τις, ὃ Spengel
 31 [ὕ]πομειδι- Cobet 1874, 31: [....]ειδι N: [....]τολιειδ O: πομειδ
 Jensen: [ἐ]πιμειδι- Spengel 33 Jensen: μενο[.] NO: βουλευόμενος
 Caterino: βουλευομένοις Sauppe

21i Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 18.1–38 (BT 31–33
 Jensen)

14III W πραττε
 τελεῖν καὶ [μὴ] ἐπι[τ]εθυμη-

in regard for the feelings of others as the inconsiderate person, but because of (his) conceited opinion that he is the only one with any sense, he is self-opinionated and believes that he will succeed in everything (if he goes it alone), but that he will fail if he avails himself of the judgment of another person; he also has his share of arrogance. He is the kind, without consulting anybody, to go abroad, buy at the market, sell, run for office, carry out any other thing. And (he is the kind), if someone asks him what he is going to do, to say “I know (what I am doing).”⁴ And (he is the kind), if someone finds fault with him, to (say) with a sly smile “You (are finding fault with) me?!”⁵ And (he is the kind), if he is invited to a meeting with (someone) seeking advice, to refuse to state what he thinks unless (this person) is going to do it. And (in) all things in which he has failed, (he is the kind to) . . .⁶

¹ See **21a** n.1 and **21g** n. 3.

² On these opening (χαίρειν = *salvere* = “Joy to you” = “Greetings”) and closing (ἐρρωσθαι = *valere* = “Be well” = “Best wishes”) formulas for letters, see **25** n. 5.

³ On the “selfwilled person” [αὐθέκαστος], see Knögel 1933, 28–30, Wehrli on F 14II–III p. 60 and Gigante 1997b, 347–8.

⁴ This seems to carry the connotation of “You’d like to know, eh?”

⁵ On ll. 25–32, see C. Gallavotti 1927, 476.

⁶ One would expect this to be followed by something like “he (is the kind) to blame others” or “to deny that he has failed”; cp. Ussing 1868, 169 and **21i** n. 2.

21i Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 18.1–38 (BT 31–33 Jensen)¹

act . . . (he is the kind) . . . to carry into effect (?) and to claim

κέναι γενέσθαι φάσκειν· καὶ
 μὴ δυσωπεῖσθαι τοῦνομα κα-
 5 λούμενος ὡς αὐθέκαστος, [ἀ]λ-
 λὰ καὶ ἔτι παιδάρια λέγειν [εἰ-]
 ναι τοὺς ὡς παιδαγωγοῖς ἄ[λ-]
 λοις προσανατιθεμένους·
 καὶ μόνος ἔχειν πώγωνα καὶ
 10 πολιάς· καὶ ζῆν δυνήσεσθαι
 > γενόμενος ἐν ἐρημίαι. τού-
 του δ' ἔτι χείρων ἐστὶν ὁ παν-
 τειδήμων ἀναπεπεικὼς ἐ-
 αὐτό[ν], ὅτι π[ά]ντα γινώσκε[ι], τὰ
 15 μὲν μαθὼ[ν] παρὰ τῶν μάλι-
 στ' ἐπ[ι]σταμένων, τὰ δ' ἰδὼν
 ποιοῦντας μόνον, τὰ δ' αὐτὸς
 ἐπινοήσας ἄφ' [α]ὐτοῦ· κᾶστι τοι-
 οὔτος οὐ μ[ό]νον οἶον Ἰππίαν
 20 τὸν Ἥλεϊον [ἰ]στ[ο]ρεῖ Πλάτων,
 ὅσα περὶ τὸ [σῶμ'] εἶχεν αὐτῷ
 πεποιηκέναι λέγειν, ἀλλὰ
 καὶ κατασκ[ευάζε]ιν οἰκίαν καὶ
 πλοῖον δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ χωρὶς
 25 ἀρχιτέκτονος· καὶ γράφειν
 συνθήκας ἑαυτῷ δεομένας
 ἐμπειρίας νομικῆς· καὶ δούλους
 ἰδίους ἰατρ[ε]ύ[ειν], μὴ μόνον ἐ-
 αὐτόν, ἐπιχειρεῖν δὲ καὶ ἄλ-
 30 λους· καὶ φυτεύειν καὶ φορτί-
 ζεσθαι τὰ μάλισθ' ὑπὸ τῶν τε-
 χνι[τι]κωτάτων κατορθούμε-
 να· καὶ ναυαγῶν ἐν ἅπασιν μ[η-]
 δ' οὐ[τ]ω παύεσθαι τῆς ἀ[πο]πλη-
 35 ξί[ας]· οἶος δὲ καὶ [τῶ]ν μαθημά-
 των ἀντιποιοῦμενο[ς] π[ά]ν-
 των [ἀσχ]ημονεῖν· καὶ το[ύς] κα-]
 ταγελῶντας ἀπείρους λέγει[ν]

[vid. ad 21a] 1–38 vid. L. Spengel, 1838, 1014–5 9–10 cf. Ar., Th.
 189–90 20 Pl., Hp. Mi. 368B5–6

not to have desired (it) to happen.² And (he is the kind) not to be discountenanced when he is explicitly called “self-willed,” but even to say that those who are (forever) deferring to others as (if they were their) tutors are still little children; and that he is the only one to have a beard and gray hair(s);³ and that he will manage to stay alive if he finds himself in a deserted place.

Even worse than this person is the *know-it-all*,⁴ who has completely convinced himself that he knows everything, having learned some things from those who are most knowledgeable, having only seen (others) do other things, and having worked out other things by himself. And he is that kind of person not only after the manner of Hippias of Elis, of whom Plato reports that he (Hippias) said that he had manufactured for himself everything that he was wearing around his body, but also (the kind) to construct a house and a boat by himself and without (the help of) a professional builder. And (he is the kind) to draw up contracts for himself, although these require legal expertise. And (he is the kind) to act as doctor to his own slaves, not only to himself, and also to try it on others. And (he is the kind) to (engage in) the planting and shipping of produce that is especially well dealt with by the top specialists. And (he is the kind), when he suffers shipwreck in everything, not even then to stop his deranged behavior. He is the kind also to disgrace himself by laying claim to all branches of exact science. And (he is the kind) to call those who laugh at him ignorant . . .

¹ See **21a** n. 1 and **21g** n. 3.

² Sauppe 1853, 26 connects the end of col. 17 with the beginning of col. 18; with his supplements in l. 1 of col. 18 this would give: “And in all things in which he has failed (he is the kind) to say that in doing it he had no wish to complete it and has not desired it to happen”; see, however, the *apparatus criticus* of **21a** on the mutilation of the upper ends of the columns.

³ Gigante 2000a, 147 sees in this a reference to Aristophanes’ *Women at the Thesmophoria* 189–90, where Euripides is explaining to Agathon why he does not dare to infiltrate the Thesmophoria himself: “First, everybody knows me. Second, I have gray hair and a beard.”

⁴ On the “know-it-all” [παντειδῆμων], see Knögel 1933, 30–2, Wehrli on F 14III–IV p. 60–1 and 64; Gigante 1997b, 348–51.

[vid. ad **21a**] 1 πράττε *N*: “in *O* et in *pap.* nihil legitur” *Jensen*: πράττει *Spengel*: post ἀποτέτευχε col. 17.36 (**21h.36**) | πράττ[ων, μὴ βεβουλήσθαι ἀπο]τελεῖν *Sauppe*, sed vid. ad **21a** 2 *Sauppe*: κα[ὶ μὴδ’] *Spengel*: κα[ὶ τὸς] *Ussing* 18 ας[...]*υ NO*: αφ[α “in fragmento exstat” *Jensen*: ἀφ’ [αὐτοῦ] *Spengel*, *Wehrli*: δι’ [αὐτοῦ] *Sauppe* 20 ηλειονφουερεῖ *VH* (in fragmento cτ *N*): ηλεις [...]*ρει O*: [ἐ]φ[’ οὐ ἐ]ρεῖ *Caterino*: φ[λυα]ρεῖ *Spengel*: [μαρτυ]ρεῖ *Sauppe*: [ἰστο]ρεῖ *Ussing*; de hoc loco vid. *Jensen* p. XI–XII 21 *Spengel* 23 *Caterino* 27–8 δούλους | ιδίους: δόσεις | διδοὺς *Ussing* 28 *Caterino* 31–2 τεχνικωτάτων *edd.* 34, 36 et 37 *Caterino*

21j Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 19.1–37 (BT 33–4 *Jensen*)

14IV W ο]ὕκ ἂν δι
 > δων ἐπιτρέπειν. τῷ μὲν
 οὖν ἀνθάδει τὰ τ’ ἐκ τῆς οἰήσε-
 ως καὶ τῆς ὑπε[ρ]ηφανίας καὶ ὑ-
 5 περοψίας, εἰ μὴ καὶ τῆς ἀλαζο-
 νείας, δυσχερῇ παρακολουθεῖ
 καὶ ιδίως τὰ ἐκ τῆς εἰκαιότη-
 τος καὶ τὰ διὰ τῆς ὀργῆς τούτων
 οἷς οὕτω προσφέρεται, καὶ τὸ
 10 τυγχάνειν ὁμοίων ἢ μὴδὲ βου-
 λομένων εἰς ὅτιδήποτε κοι-
 νῶνημα συνκαταβαίνειν
 δυσχρηστεῖσθαι, καὶ τὸ περὶ
 μαινομένου πάντας φέρεσ-
 15 θαι καὶ καθαλεῖν, διότι τὴν
 κακίαν ἔχειν αὐτὸν ὑπονοοῦ-
 > σιν. τῷ δ’ ἀνθεκάστωι τὰ τε
 παρὰ τὰς ἀτοπίας, ἐξ ὧν μέμει-
 κται, καὶ τὸ μόνον ἀφραίνειν,
 20 ὅτι μόνος οἶεται περὶ πάν-
 των φρονεῖν· διὸ καὶ τοῖς
 πλείστοις ἀπο[τ]υγχάνειν, καὶ
 ἐπιχαίρεσθαι μετὰ καταγέ-
 λωτος ὑπὸ πάντων κα[ὶ] μ[η-]
 25 δὲ βοηθεῖσθαι, καὶ μὴδὲ τῶν
 σοφῶν ἀναμαρτήτων εἶναι

- 21j** Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 19.1–37 (BT 33–4 Jensen)¹

. . . would not . . . entrust to . . .

(The behavior of) the *inconsiderate* person,² then, is attended by the vexatious consequences arising from his conceit and his arrogance and disdain, if not his boastfulness as well, and, in his particular case, by those arising from his thoughtlessness and those occasioned by the anger of the people towards whom he behaves in this manner. And (his behavior is attended by the vexatious consequence of) his meeting with people who are like him or, if people do not wish to enter into any kind of common dealings with him at all, his being brought into distress. And that where he is concerned, everybody acts as if he is out of his mind and puts him down,³ because they suspect that the vice (of madness) possesses him.

For the *self-willed* person⁴ (the vexatious consequences are) those attending the odd characteristics of which he is compounded, and his being the only one to have no sense, since he thinks that he is the only one to have any sense about everything; this also being the reason why he fails in most things. And that he is made fun of with derision by everybody and certainly does not get any help, and, whereas the wise men claim to be neither unerring nor

λεγόντων μηδ' ἀπροσδέκ-
 των συμβουλίας, τοῦτον ὑπὲρ
 αὐτοὺς νομίζοντα φρονεῖν
 30 ἐξ ἀνάγκης κακοδαίμονεῖν·
 ληρεῖν δὲ καί, διότι τὴν κοι-
 νῶς σύνεσιν οἶεται περιπε-
 ποιῆσθαι τὰ τῶν ιδίας ἐμπει-
 ρίας ἐχόντων, καὶ μεταμεμε-
 35 λῆσθ[α]ι πολλῶν ἐξ ἀνάγκης
 ἐνκυρεῖν, καὶ λοιδορίας καρποῦ-
 σθαι καὶ προσκ ρων

[vid. ad 21a] 2–37 vid. Spengel 1838, 1016 2–17 cf. 21g.29–
 21h.17 17–37 & 21k.1–3 cf. 21h.17–21i.11 19 ἀφραίνειν : vid.
 Knögel 1933, 67–8

[vid. ad 21a] 10 τυγχάνων Ussing 1868, 171 12 -βαινων N :
 -βαινειν O, Jensen 13 τὸ ὥσπερ) περὶ dubitanter Philippon 1912,
 393 15 καθαιρεῖν edd.: καθαιρεῖν Spengel 19 αφρονειν VH,
 Spengel: αφραινειν NO, Sauppe, Jensen, Wehrli 21 κἂν Sauppe 32
 post κοινῶς excidisse credit Jensen (λεγομένην) vel ὑπάρχουσιν),
 “quorum alterum falsum alterum supervacaneum” Wehrli 35 λισθ[.]ι
 N: vacat in O et in papyro || πολλῶ Spengel 37 προσκ[αλεισθαι
 λη]ρῶν Caterino : προσκ[ρούσεις ἐτέ]ρῶν Sauppe

21k Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 20.1–37 (BT 35–6 Jensen)

.....
 14V W φάσθ[αι ἄν]θρωπ[ον ὁμοί-]
 ὦν ἀνθρώπ[ων οὐκ ἔ]χειν χρει-
 >αν. ὁ δὲ παντειδ[ή]μων ἅμα
 τοῖς εἰρημένοις πᾶσι καὶ μαρ-
 5 γιτομανῆς ἐστίν, εἰ καὶ τὸν
 ὄντως πολυμαθέστατον προσ-
 αγορευόμενον οἶεται πάντα
 δύνασθαι γινώσκειν καὶ ποι-
 εῖν, οὐχ οἷον ἑαυτόν, ὃς ἐνίστε
 10 οὐδέν τι φωρᾶται κατέχων
 καὶ οὐ συνορῶν ὅτι πολλὰ δεῖ-
 ται τριβῆς, ἂν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐ-

unreceptive of advice, he, believing that he has more sense than they, of necessity runs into bad luck. And that he also talks nonsense, because he thinks that his everyday intelligence has procured (him) the (expertise) of those who possess expert knowledge in their own particular field.⁵ And that of necessity it is bound to happen (to him) to regret many things,⁶ and to reap abuse and . . .⁷

¹ See **21a** n.1 and **21g** n. 3.

² Lines 2–17 contain comments on the negative effects of the character type of the “inconsiderate person” [αὐθάδης], corresponding to the character sketch in col. 16.29–17.17 (**21g**.29–**21h**.17).

³ If that is what ll. 13–16 mean. Rusten renders “and that everyone rushes away and dismisses him for a madman” (cp. Ussing 1868, 171). Tsouna reads καθαίρειν (with Spengel) instead of καθαίρειν: “by the fact that, when dealing with a madman, everybody runs around and performs purifications.”

⁴ Lines 17–37 and lines 1–3 of col. 20 (**21k**.1–3) contain comments on the negative effects of the character type of the “self-willed person” [αὐθέκαστος], corresponding to the character sketch in col. 17.17–18.11 (**21h**.17–**21i**.11).

⁵ On lines 31–4, see C. Gallavotti 1927, 476.

⁶ On the construction in ll. 34–6, see Sauppe 1853, 28 and Ussing 1868, 172.

⁷ Or, the infinitive καρποῦσθαι being coordinate with the infinitive ἐνκυρεῖν and not dependent on it, “and that he reaps abuse and . . .” Sauppe’s supplement would give “and attacks of others.”

21k Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 20.1–37 (BT 35–6 Jensen)¹

. . . that a human being has no need of human beings like himself.²

The *know-it-all* is,³ along with all that has been said, also mad as Margites,⁴ if he thinks that even the man who is truly addressed as a genuine polymath is able to know and do everything — not to speak of a man like himself, who at times is caught lacking any competence and unable to comprehend that many things require practice,⁵ even if they arise through the same method, as do the

τῆς γίνηται μεθόδου, καθά-
 περ τὰ τῆς ποιητικῆς μέρη, καὶ
 15 διότι περὶ τοὺς πολυμαθεῖς
 ὁσμαιὶ μόνον εἰσὶ πολλῶν, οὐ
 κατοχαί, καὶ τὰ ποτεύγματα
 περίεστιν τῶν παιδευμά-
 των, οὐ τὰ κατορθώματα, καὶ
 20 πάνθ' ὅσα τοῖς τοιούτοις συμ-
 βαίνειν ἀνελogiζόμεθα· καὶ
 διότι πολλὰ γινώσκειν, ὧν
 [Ἰππ]ία[ς] ἐκαυχᾶτο, καὶ τὸ πα-
 ραπλήσιον πᾶν γένος ὀνει-
 25 δη μᾶλλον ἐστὶν ἥπερ ἐγκώ-
 μια· καὶ — τί γὰρ δεῖ τᾶλλα πε-
 ρὶ ληρούντων λέγειν; — ὥς, ὅταν
 ἀτυχήσωσι, φωρῶνται κατα-
 φεύγοντες ἐπὶ τοὺς τυχόν-
 30 τας καὶ τῶν ἐ[λ]αχίστων ἐλάτ-
 τους αὐτοὺς εἶναι προσομο-
 λογοῦσιν. ὁ μὲν οὖν ὑπερή-
 φανος καὶ ὑπερόπτης ἐστίν, ὁ
 δ' ὑπερό[π]της οὐ πάν[τ]ως καὶ ὑ-
 35 πε[ρ]ηφανεῖ καὶ ἅπα[ν]τα διὰ τὸ
 χηρ[.] ἔστιν ὅτε τα
 εἶνα[ι]· πέφυκε δ' οὐ

[vid. ad **21a**] 3–32 vid. Spengel 1838, 1022–3 et cf. **21i.11–21j.2** 4–
 5 μαργιτομανής: cf. Phld., Rhet. 4 col. 25^a.12–14 (1.207 Sudhaus) τὸ
 δὲ τῶν ἄλλων τινὸς ἢ ἀντιποιεῖσθαι μαργιτομανίας ὅρους ἴστησι;
 Harp. μ 6 Keaney s.v. Μαργίτης; “insane stolidus” Sauppe; cf. Knögel
 1933, 64, sed vid. M. Gigante 1998, 112 23 [Ἰππ]ία[ς]: cf. **21i.19**

[vid. ad **21a**] 1–2 [ἀπο]φάσθ[αι τὸν ἄν]θρωπ[ον ἄλλ]ων ἀνθ-
 ρώπ[ων δεῖν] ἔχειν χρεῖλαν Sauppe: φασθ[αι ... ἄν]θρωπ[ος] ἢ ὧν
 ἀνθρώπ[ων οὐκ] ἔχειν χρεῖλαν Ussing: φάσθ[αι ... ἄν]θρωπ[ον
 ἄλλ]ων ἀνθρώπ[ων οὐκ] ἔχειν χρεῖλαν Wehrli ἢ [ὁμοί]ων: cf. **21j.10**
 9 ενιοις N: εν[...]ε O: ενιοτε Jensen: ὅς [ἐν] ἐνίοις Spengel 23
 [.....]ε N: [...]ια [.]c O: ι[...]α[.]ε Jensen: ὧν ἢ [ἐμπειρ]ία Sauppe: ὥς
 ἢ [ὁ Ἰππ]ία[ς] Ussing: ὥς ἢ [Ἰππ]ία[ς] Wehrli 36 “post litteram P ves-
 tigia litterae A vel Λ in pap. legisse mihi videor” Jensen: διὰ τὸ ἢ
 [θυμοῦ] χῆρ[ον, ἔ]στιν ὅτε τα[πεινὸν] εἶναι Philippsen 1912, 393

parts of the art of poetry; and that around the polymaths there are only scents of many things, not a thorough grasp (of them), and that it is the failures of what has been learned by instruction that remain, not the successes, and all the other things that we listed as happening to such people; and that to have knowledge of many things, of which Hippias used to boast,⁶ and the whole class of things of that kind, is more a matter for reproach than an occasion for praise. And—but why need one say the other things about people who talk nonsense?—for whenever they fail, they are caught in the act of taking refuge with anyone who is at hand, and (thus) they concede that they are themselves worse than the worst.

To resume, the arrogant person is also *disdainful*,⁷ but the disdainful person does not necessarily behave arrogantly as well and in everything on account of the fact . . . bereft . . . sometimes . . . to be . . .⁸ And he is naturally disposed not to . . .

¹ See **21a** n. 1 and **21g** n. 3.

² See **21j** n. 4. On ll. 1–2 see Gallavotti 1927, 476 and Knögel 1933, 41.

³ Lines 3–32 contain comments on the negative effects of the character type of the “know-it-all” [παντειδῆμων], corresponding to the character sketch in col. 18.11–19.2 (**21i**.11–**21j**.2). This passage appears to differ from those on the “inconsiderate person” (**21j**.2–17) and the “self-willed person” (**21j**.17–**21k**.3) in that not only the negative effects of this character type are commented on, but the character sketch itself is supplemented (note in ll. 3–4 the phrase “along with all that has been said”); see Knögel 1933, 31.

⁴ The compound μαργιτομανής “mad as Margites” is not attested elsewhere (apart from the noun μαργειτομανία also in Philodemus, *On Rhetoric* 4 col. 25^a.12–4 [1.207 Sudhaus]). Margites (a derivation of μάργος “insane”) is the (anti-)hero of an epic poem commonly ascribed to Homer (for the fragments, see *IEG* 2.69–76). In [Pl.], *Alc.* 2 147C–D (= F 3 *IEG* West) it is said of him that “he had knowledge of many works, but knew them all badly.” Gigante 1998, 112 interprets the compound in the sense of “mad about Margites” rather than “mad as Margites,” i.e., the person involved is affected by “margitismo.”

⁵ On ἄσκησις and μάθησις as complementary concepts in Peripatetic thought, see Knögel 1933, 31.

⁶ See **21i**.19–22.

⁷ After the comments on the “inconsiderate” person, the “self-willed” person and the “know-it-all,” the character sketches are resumed (cp. **21g** n. 3). The end of column 20 and the beginning of column 21 are lost. This makes it difficult to reconstruct the text, but it is clear that three types are mentioned: the “the disdainful person” [ὑπερόπτης], the “the person affecting solemnity” (σεμνοκόπος), and the “the swaggerer” [βρενθύμενος]. The last two appear to be considered as a species of the first; see Knögel 1933, 32–3 and 39.

⁸ Philippson’s supplements in ll. 36–7 would give “on account of his being bereft of anger, at moments lowly.” (?)

211 Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 21.1–39 (BT 36–8 Jensen)

14VI W [— *ca.* 20 *litt.* — τὸν μὲν σ]εμ-
 [νὸ]ν ἐπαινοῦ[ντες] ὥς ἀξίαν
 ἔχοντα μετὰ τίνος αὐστηρί-
 ας, τὸν δὲ σεμνοκόπον καὶ τό-
 5 τε καὶ νῦν πάντως ψέγοντες
 ὥς ἐπιφάσκοντα τὸν εἰρη-
 μένον καὶ προσποιούμενον
 εἶναι τοιοῦτον ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις
 καὶ διὰ τῶν λόγων (ὃν σεμνο-
 10 μυθεῖν ἔλεγον) καὶ [τῶ]ι [σ]χή-
 ματι τοῦ προσώπου καὶ τῶν
 ὀμμάτων καὶ περιβολῇ καὶ
 κινήσει καὶ ταῖς κατὰ τὸν βί-
 > ον ἐνεργείαις. καὶ βρενθύε-
 15 σθαι δὲ καὶ βρενθυόμενον
 ὠνόμαζον καὶ ἔτι νῦν ὀνο-
 μάζουσιν (εἴτ' ἀπὸ τοῦ παρα-
 δεδομένου θυμιάματος ἢ
 μύρου τῶν [θ]εῶν βρένθυος,
 20 ὥς καθ' ἡμᾶς καὶ μίνθωνος ἀ-
 πὸ τῆς μίνθης, εἴτ' ἀφ' ὅτουδή-
 ποτε) τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς εἰρημένης
 διαθέσεως κατεμβλέπον-
 τα πᾶσιν καὶ παρεμβλέποντα
 25 καὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ κατασείον-
 τα καὶ κατασμικρίζοντα
 τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας ἢ τοὺς ὦν
 ἄν τις μνημονεύσῃ, κἂν
 ὥσι τῶν μεγάλων εἶναι δο-
 30 κούντων, μετὰ διασυρμοῦ
 καὶ μόλις που βραχείας ἀπο-
 κρίσεως ὑπεροχὴν ἰδίαν ἐμ-
 φαινούσης, ἄλλου δ' οὐδενὸς
 ἀριθμὸν ἐμποιοῦση[ς, ὅπ]οι-
 35 ον ὁ Ἀριστοφάνης “ὄ[τ]ι βρενθύ-
 [ῃ] τ' ἐν ταῖσιν ὁδοῖς καὶ τῶ-

- 211 Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 21.1–39 (BT 36–8 Jensen)¹

. . . praising the solemn person as possessing dignity combined with a certain austerity, but absolutely censuring both then and now the person *affecting solemnity*² as professing (to be like) the person just mentioned and pretending to be that kind of person among large crowds, both by his manner of speaking — this is the kind of person who was said to utter solemnities — and by the cast of his face and his eyes, and by (his) attire and (his) gait and by his occupations in life. In addition, they applied and even now still apply the names of “swaggering” [*brenthyesthai*] and “swaggerer” [*brenthyomenon*] — whether (these) derive from the (burnt) incense or perfumed oil of the gods transmitted as *brenthys*,³ just as in our time (the word) *minthôn* derives from mint [*minthê*],⁴ or from whatever (else) — to the person who, as a result of the said disposition, looks down and askance at everybody, and shakes his head disapprovingly, and belittles those who come his way or whom someone mentions — even if they belong to the people who are esteemed to be important — with disparagement and just barely a brief reply intimating his own superiority and not taking (ac)count of anyone else; — the kind of person the comic poet Aristophanes ridiculed (saying): “because you swagger in the

φθαλμὸν παραβάλλεις” ἐκω-
[μῶ]ιδει. ὁ δ’ εἴρων ὥς ἐπὶ τὸ
[πλ]εῖστον ἀλαζόνος εἶδος

[vid. ad **21a**; cols. 21–3 (**21I–21n**) post Jensen denuo e papyro edd. E. Acosta Méndez & A. Angeli 1992, 152–4 (= Socrates T 5). 183–4, 219–31 (= A.-A.) et G. Ranocchia 2001, 245–50, quem sequimur; vid. etiam Indelli 2003] 4 σεμνοκόπον: cf. Phld., Rhet. 5 fr. 20.3–4 σεμνοκοποῦντας (2.159 Sudhaus) 9–10 σεμνομυθεῖν: cf. E., Andr. 234; Hipp. 490; Phot., Lex. 2.506.14 Porson = Suda ὁ 226 σεμνομυθοῦσιν ὑπερηφανεύονται ἐν λόγοις 15 βρενθυόμενον: cf. Ar., Lys. 887; Pax 26 17–19 cf. Eust., Il. 8.14 (2.516.15–517.3 Van der Valk); cf. etiam Sappho F 94.18–20 Lobel-Page et Ath. 15.42 690D–E 32–3 ὑπεροχὴν—ἐμφανιούσης: cf. **21o**.11–12 35–7 Ar., Nu. 362 et Pl., Smp. 221B3–4; de Aristophane cf. **21i**.9–10; de Socrate cf. **21a**.23; **21m**.36; **21n**.36 38 cf. Arist., EN 1108a19–23 et 1127a13–14 38–**21n**.37 cf. Thphr., Char. 1 Εἰρωνεία

[vid. ad **21a**] 1–2 ... [τὸν μὲν σεμνὸν]ν Jensen, A.-A.: iam Sauppe 4 σεμνόκο(μ)πον Cobet 1874, 29 coll. Ath. 9.67 447C 9–10 σεμνομυθεῖν Sauppe 10 [τῶ]ι σχή- Jensen: [τῶ]ι σχή- A.-A. 14 post-αῖς spatium vacuum 19 [θ]εῶν Jensen: [θ]εῶν A.-A. 20 μίνθωνας Sauppe 27 ὦν Jensen: [ῶ]ν A.-A. 34 ἀρ[....]ν Vñ, unde ἀρ[α λόγ]ον Sauppe: ἀρ[ιθμὸν]ν Hartung: ἀριθμὸν Jensen: ἀρ[ιθμὸν]ν A.-A. 34–5 οὐ[.]η[....]οῖλον Ranocchia: ἐμποιοῦσιν N: ἐμνοιοῦσι O: οὐκ ἐμνοιοῦσιν N²: ἐμποιοῦσ[ης, ὅπ]οῖλον Sauppe: ἐμποιοῦσ[ης]· οἶλον Jensen et ἐμποιοῦσ[ης]· οἶλον A.-A. “spatio brevius” Ranocchia 35 ὅ[τ]ι Sauppe: ὅ[τ]ι Jensen: [ὅ]τι A.-A. 35–6 βρενθύ[ει τ’] Jensen, A.-A. 36–7 τῶ[φ]θαλμῶ Jensen: τ[ῶ]φθαλμῶ A.-A. 37–8 ἐκω[μῶ]ιδει Jensen, A.-A. 38 [ὁ] δ’ εἴρων Jensen: ὁ [δ’] εἴρων A.-A.

21m Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, PHerc. 1008, col. 22.1–38 (BT 38–40 Jensen)

[.....].....[.....].
14VII W ..[. δ]ιανοεῖ[.]ωσ[.....]
ον, [ἀ]λλὰ καὶ τάναν[τί]α μάλ-
λον ὥστ’ ἐπαινεῖν ὃν ψέγει[ι, τ]α-
5 πεινοῦν δὲ καὶ ψέγειν ἑαυτ[ό]ν
τε καὶ τοὺς οἰός ἐστιν εἰωθ[έ]ναι
πρὸς ὀνδῆποτε χρόνον με-
τὰ παρεμφάσεως ὧν βούλε[τ]αι·
συνεπινοεῖται δ’ αὐτῶι καὶ

streets and cast your eyes aside.”⁵

The *ironic* person is,⁶ by and large, a species of the pretentious person . . .

¹ See **21a** n.1; **21g** n. 3; **21k** n. 7. On column 21, see Knögel 1933, 32–4 and the commentary in Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 219–25.

² On the “the person affecting solemnity” [σεμνοκόπος] and the “swaggerer” [βρενθυόμενος], see Knögel 1933, 32–4 and Gigante 1997b, 351–2.

³ On the meaning of the word *brenthys*, see Knögel 1933, 61–2 and Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 222–4.

⁴ The word *minthôn* must originally have denoted some kind of perfume, but here appears to refer to a sexual pervert; cp. Lucian, Lexiphanes 12. See Knögel 1933, 63 and Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 224.

⁵ In Aristophanes’ *Clouds* 358–63 the chorus of clouds is addressing Socrates: “All hail, . . . and you, priest of the subtlest balderdash, tell us what you desire; for we would not give ear to any other present-day celestial expert except for Prodicus, in his case because of his skill and intelligence, in yours because you swagger in the streets and cast your eyes sideways, go barefoot and endure much suffering, and give yourself airs on our account” (trans. A.H. Sommerstein). See Gigante 2000a, 146–7 on this (according to him, second; cp. **21i** n. 3) reference to the comic poet Aristophanes. On the reference to Socrates, see Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 219–21.

⁶ On the “ironic person”, [εἴρων] see Knögel 1933, 34–9; Wehrli on F 14VI–VIII p. 61; Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 219–21; Nardelli 1984, 531–4; Ioppolo 1996; Gigante 1997b, 352–4. For a German translation of the passage on the “ironic person” (cols. 22–3 [**21m-n**]), see Büchner 1941, 351–2; for an English one, see Kleve 1983, 246–7.

21m Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 22.1–38 (BT 38–40 Jensen)¹

. . . he has in mind . . . but rather even the opposite, so as to be in the habit of praising (a person) whom he faults, but of diminishing and censuring himself and those such as he is,² on any occasion at all with only an indirect hint of what he has in mind.³ Included in our conception of him is also cleverness in fabrication

- 10 δειν[ό]της ἐν τῷ [πλ]άσματ[ι]
καὶ πιθανότης, ἔσ[τι]ν δὲ τ[οι-]
οὔτος οἶος τὰ πολλ[ὰ] μωκᾶ[σ-]
θαι καὶ μορφάζειν καὶ μειδι-
ᾶν καὶ ὑπανίστασ[θ]αί τιςιν ὥς
15 ἐπιστᾶσιν ἄφνωι μ[ε]τ' ἀναπ[ή-]
δήσεως καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως·
καὶ μέχρι πολλοῦ [σ]υνὼν ἐνί-
οις σιωπᾶν· καὶ ἐπαινῇ τις
αὐτόν ἢ κελεύει τι [κε]λέ[υ] γ' εἰν
20 ἢ μνημονευθήσεσθαι φῶσιν
αὐτόν, ἐπιφώνειν “ἐγὼ γὰρ
οἶδα τί πλήν [γ]ε τούτου ὅτι [οὐ-]
δὲν οἶδα;” καὶ “τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν λ[ό-]
γος;” καὶ “εἰ δὲ τις ἡμῶν ἔστα[ι]
25 μνεία”· καὶ πολλὸς [ε]ῖναι τ[ῷ]
“μάκάριοι τ[ῆς] φ[ύσ]εως οἱ μ[έν]
τινες” ἢ “τῆς δυνάμεως” ἢ “τ[ῆς]
τύχης”· καὶ μὴ ψιλῶς ὀνομά-
ζειν, ἀλλὰ “Φαῖδρος ὁ καλός”
30 καὶ “Λυσίας ὁ σοφός” καὶ ῥήμα-
τ' ἄ[μ]φίβολα τιθέναι, “χρη[σ]τόν,”
“ἡδύν,” “ἀφελῇ,” “γενναῖον,” “ἀν[δρεῖ-]
ον”· καὶ παρεπιδείκνυσθ[αι]
μὲν ὥς σοφά, προσάπτειν δ' [ἐ-]
35 [τέροις], ὥς Ἀσπασίαι καὶ [Ἰσχο-]
[μά]χῳ Σφωκράτης· καὶ πρὸς[ς]
τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαιρεσι[ῶν ἄ-]
πόλυομένους· “ἔδοκιμ[ά]σθης]

[vid. ad 21a et 211] 1–38 cf. *Thphr., Char. 1* Εἰρωνεία 4 cf. *Thphr., Char. 1.2* 21–3 de *Socrate* cf. *Pl., Ap. 21D; Hp.Mi. 372B4–7; D.L. 2.32; Cic., Acad. 1.16* 23–4 cf. *Ar., Ra. 107 & 115* 26–8 cf. *Pl. Euthd. 274A6–7; 303C4* 31 cf. *Pl., Phdr. 266E6; Thphr., Char. 29.3* 32 cf. *Pl., Grg. 491E2; 473D3; 494D4; de voce ἀφελῆς* cf. *εὐθήθεια in Resp. 3 400E1–2* 35 de *Aspasia* cf. *Phld., Oec. col. 2.18 et Pl., Mx. 236D4–249C8* 35–6 de *Ischomacho* cf. *Phld., Oec. col. 5.14–15; Xen., Oec. 7–21* 36–8 cf. *Xen., Mem. 3.4.1*

[vid. ad 21a] 2 [...]ιανοεῖ NO : [... δ]ιανοεῖ [...]οσ[.....] Jensen : [... δ]ιανοεῖ [...]c. [...]c. [...] A.-A. : ἄ νοεῖ Sauppe : [δ]ιανοεῖ[ται] Delattre

and persuasiveness. He is such a person as on most occasions to mimic in mockery and make faces and smile and get up out of his seat for certain people—as if⁴ they come upon him by surprise—suddenly with a jump and uncovering of his head. And he (is the kind) to remain silent for a long time in company. And (he is the kind), if someone praises him or asks him to say something, or (if) people say that he will be remembered, to exclaim: “Why, what do I know except this, that I know nothing?”⁵ and “Why, what does our (opinion) count for?” and “If indeed any will remember us.” And (he is the kind) to be constantly saying things like “Blessed in their natural gifts (are) some people”⁶ or “in what they are capable of” or “in their good fortune.” And (he is the kind) not to call people merely by name but (to say) “Phaedrus the fair” or “Lysias the sage,” and to use ambiguous expressions, (such as) “good,” “sweet,” “simple,” “noble,” “brave.”⁷ And (he is the kind) slyly to show off ideas of his own as wise, but to attribute them to other people, as Socrates (did) with Aspasia and Ischomachus.⁸ And (he is the kind to (say) to those who are being dismissed from the elections for a public office “you have been examined, . . .”⁹

¹ See **21a** n. 1; **21g** n. 3; **21i** n. 6. On column 22, see Knögel 1933, 32–4 and the commentary in Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 225–8.

² According to Rusten, 193 the text is corrupt here: “probably several words are missing.” With Delattre’s conjecture in l. 6 and Tsouna’s comma in l. 7, the text is rendered by Tsouna as: “. . . but of humiliating and blaming himself and those who deserve praise for as long as he feels like it, . . .”

³ Knögel 1933, 66 is followed here in the rendering of *παρέμφασις* as “indirect hint” (“leise Andeutung”) rather than “misrepresentation,” as it is usually interpreted.

⁴ This is an attempt to render *ὥς* at the end of line 14, which is hard to account for.

⁵ Socrates’ famous statement; see Plato’s *Apology* 21D.

⁶ The exact reading is uncertain: the reading with *δὲ* would make the irony explicit; Büchner’s conjecture would give: “. . ., if there are any.”

⁷ See the commentary of Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 226–7 and Kleve 1983, 246–7 for parallels for these idiomatic expressions.

⁸ As is done by Plato in *Menexenus*, where Socrates quotes a funeral speech allegedly composed by Aspasia for Pericles, and by Xenophon in *Oeconomicus* 7–21, where Socrates has a lengthy discussion with Ischomachus on estate management.

⁹ With the supplement of Ussing the sentence as a whole would run: “You would have passed muster, if they had chosen you.”

3–6 *Sauppe* 6 τοὺς (ἐπαινέτοὺς) *Delattre* || εἰωθ[έναι] *Jensen*, A.-A. 7 χρόνον, *Tsouna* || μ[ε]τὰ A.-A. 8 *Sauppe* 9 α[ὐ]τῶι A.-A. 10 τῶι[....]μα[.] *NO* : τῶι [πλ]άσμα[τι] *Jensen* : τῶι [πλ]άσμα[τι] A.-A. : τῶι [σχή]μα[τι] *Sauppe* : τῶι [ψέγ]μα[τι] *Ussing* 11–12 *Sauppe* 14 τισιν *N*, *Jensen* : τισιν ὡς A.-A. 15 ἄφνω{ι} *Ranocchia* : ἄφνω *Sauppe*; cf. *Crönert*, *MGH* 42 17 πολλ[οῦ] σ[υ]γγῶν *Jensen*, A.-A. || ἐ[ν]ίλοις *Jensen*, A.-A. 18 *post* -πᾶν *spatium vacuum* 22 τί πλ[ήν] γε] *Jensen* : τί πλ[ήν] γε] A.-A. : π[.....]τ *N* : λ *O* : τι π[λέον] *Caterino* : τί π[αρ]εξ] *Sauppe* : τι π[λήν] *Cobet* 1874, 30 25 [μ]νεία *Sauppe* : [.]ησια *N* : [.]νσια *O* || πολὺς [εἶ]ναι τ[ῶι] *Jensen*, A.-A. : πολὺν [εἶ]ναι τ[ῶι] *Sauppe* : πολὺς [φά]ναι τ[ὸ] *Delattre* 25–7 τ[ῶι] | μακαρίζειν, τ[ῆς] φ[ύσ]εως οἱ[οί] | τινες *Sauppe* 26–8 *interpunxit* *Wehrli* 26 οἱ μ[έν] *Jensen*, A.-A. : οἱ δ[ή] *Jensen ap. Knögel* 1933, 56¹ (“*alterutrum litterarum* (μ *vel* δ) *vestigia pariter cerni possunt*” *Ranocchia* : εἰ δ[ή] τινες *Büchner* 1941, 351⁶, *Wehrli* : οἶμαι *Tsouna* 31 *Caterino* : χρ[υσοῦν] *Cobet* 1874, 30 32–3 *Sauppe* 34 μὲν ὡς *Cobet* 1874, 30 : [ἀσ]μένως *Sauppe* 34–5 δ[ὲ] ἐτέροις] *Hartung* : δ’ [ἐτέρῳι] *Cobet* 1874, 30 : [δ’ ἐτέροις] *Jensen*, A.-A. : δ’ [ἅλλοις τισίν] *Sauppe* : δ’ [ἅλλοις] *Ussing* 35–6 [ἴσχωμά]χῳ *Cobet* 1847, 102 37–8 *Sauppe* 38 ἐδοκίμα[α ... A.-A. || *pergit* *Ussing* : ἄν, εἰ σὲ ἠρήσαντο (“*quod imprudenti excidit pro εἴλοντο*” *Cobet*) : ἄρα σὺ πάντων ὧν ἀξιώτατος *e.g. Wehrli*

21n Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 23.1–37 (BT 40–1 *Jensen*)

14VIII W [. . .]θεων . [.] . [. . .]
 μοι· πάντα γὰρ δεινὸς σὺ κα-
τεργάσασθαι· κἂν συνέλθῃ[ι, αὐ-]
 τὸν καταπληττόμενον ἐμ-
 5 φαίνειν τό τε εἶδος καὶ τὴν ἀξί-
 αν καὶ τὸν λόγον καὶ πρὸς τοὺς
 συνκαθημένους θαυμάζον-
 τα· καὶ προσκαλούμενος εἰς [κοι-]
 νολογί[α]ν φοβεῖσθαι καὶ τᾶλά-
 10 χιστα φάσκειν ἄπορα καταφαί-
 νεσθ’ ἐαυτῶι, καὶ [κα] δ’ ἰαγέλασαν-
 τος “ὀρθῶς μου καταφρονεῖς
 τηλικ[ο]ῦτος ὧν· καὶ γὰρ αὐ-
 τὸς ἐμαυτοῦ” καὶ “νέος ὄφελον
 15 εἶναι καὶ μὴ γέ[ρω]ν, ἵν’ ἐμαυ-
τὸν ὑπέ[τ]α[ξ]ί[α] σοι”· κἂν τῶν συν-

21n Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 23.1–37 (BT 40–1 Jensen)¹

“... For in everything you are formidably good at getting things done!” And (he is the kind), if he meets (him),² to make a display of being struck with amazement at his appearance and his dignity and his speech, and (to make a display) of admiration to those who are sitting near. And if he is invited to deliberate (with the other man), (he is the kind) to be afraid and to say that even the smallest things appear to him insurmountable, and if he (the other man) laughs at his (diffidence), (to say) “You are right to feel contempt for me, at your age;³ for that’s exactly how I feel about myself”⁴ and “Would that I were young and not an old man, so that I could have put myself under your orders”; and if after a perfectly clear

- παρόντω[ν ὅτο]υδῆποτ' εἰ[π]όν-
 τος ἐκδήλως ἐκείνος εἶπη[ι]
 “τοιούτον ἄ[ρ]α τί λέγεις;” ἐπ[ι]φω-
 20 νεῖν τὰ[ς χ]ε[ῖ]ρας ἀνατείνας “ὥς
 [τ]αχὺ συνῆ[κ]ας, ἀλλ' [ε] ἀφ[υ]ῆ[ς]
 ἐγὼ καὶ βραδὺς καὶ δυσαίσθητος”·
 καὶ προσέχειν μὲν διαλεγο-
 μένῳ καὶ ἐνχάσκειν, εἴθ' ὑ-
 25 ποκιναιδεῖν καὶ διανεύειν
 ἄλλοις, ποτὲ δ' ἀνακακάζειν.
 οἷος δὲ καὶ πρὸς οὓς ἔτυχεν ὁ-
 μιλῶν “διάσφαεῖτέ μοι τὰς ἐ-
 μάς ἀγραμματατίας καὶ τὰς ἄλ-
 30 [λας] ἀστοχίας ὑμεῖς, ὦ φίλοι, καὶ
 [μ]ὴ περιορᾶτ' ἀσχημονοῦν-
 [τα]” καὶ “οὐ διηγ[ή]σεσθέ μοι τὰς
 [τοῦ] δεῖνος εὐη[μ]ερίας, ἵνα χαί-
 [ρω], κἂν ἄρα δυνατός, ὥς μιμῶ-
 35 [μαι];” καὶ τί δεῖ [τ]ὰ πλείω λέγειν;
 [ἄπ]αντ[α] γὰρ τ[ὰ] Σωκρατ[ι]κὰ
 μνημονεύμα[τ]α [συλ]λέ[γ]ων

[vid. ad 21a et 21l] 1–37 cf. *Thphr., Char. I* Εἰρωνεία 14–16 cf. *Pl., Euthd.* 285B7–C5 20–1 ὥς—συνῆκας: cf. *Thphr., Char. 7* Λαλία 2 35 cf. 21g.27–8 et 21k.26–7 36 Σωκρατ[ι]κὰ: cf. 21a.23; 21l.35–7; 21m.36

[vid. ad 21a] 2–3 σὺ εἰ ἀπεργάσασθαι *Sauppe* 3 post -θαι *spatium vacuum* 3–4 συνέλθ[η]ι, αὐ]τόν *Sauppe*: συνέλθῃ | τὸν *Jensen, Wehrli* 6 καὶ² del. *Wehrli* 8–9 *Sauppe* 8 εἰ[ς] κοι- *Jensen, A.-A.* 13 post ὦν *spatium vacuum* 15 *Cobet* 1847, 102 16 ὑπέταξά *Jensen, A.-A.* 17 -τω[ν του ὅτι]δῆποτ' *Sauppe, Wehrli* || *Sauppe* 19 “τοιούτον διὰ τί λέγεις;” *Hartung*: τοιούτον “διὰ τί λέγεις;” *Sauppe* || δ[ι]ὰ τί *Jensen, A.-A.*, “sed δ[ι] in *N supra scripserunt Academici mutantes α*” *Ranocchia* 21 *Sauppe* || [c] *A.-A.* 22 βραχυς *N*, sed vid. *Jensen*: δ *Jensen*: βραδὺς *Sauppe* 24–5 ὑποκιναιδεῖν *Ussing* 26 -κακάζειν legit *Ranocchia*, -κακάζειν *A.-A.*: -κακάζειν *Cobet* 1874, 30; cf. *Crönert, MGH* 90 (“alteram litteram κ ex χ correctam esse vidi”) 28 -μιλεων *N*: μιλ[...] *O*: ὀμιλεῖν *Sauppe* 30 *Sauppe* 31 *Sauppe*: [μῆ] *A.-A.* 32 διηγ[ή]σεσθέ *Caterino, Jensen, A.-A.*: διηγ[εῖσθέ] *Ranocchia* 33 εὐημερίας *Jensen*: εὐη[μ]ε[ρ]ίας *A.-A.*: συ[ν]ε[μ]ε[ρ]ίας *Sauppe*: εὐ[ε]π[ε]ρίας *Ussing* 33–4 χαί[ρ]ω *Caterino*: καὶ →

remark by anyone present the other man says “Now, what do you mean by saying such a thing?”⁵ (he is the kind) to throw up his hands and exclaim “How quickly you have understood! — but then (how) dull I (am) and slow and stupid!” And (he is the kind), when he (the other man) is having a conversation (with him), to give him his full attention and gaze at him open-mouthed, but a moment later to make innuendos and to nod suggestively with his head to others around him, and sometimes to laugh out loud.

He is the kind, too, (to say) to whomever he happens to converse with:⁶ “You, my friends, please do point out to me my failures in literacy and my other blunders, and do not let me disgrace myself” and “Won’t you explain to me the prosperity of so-and-so, that I may rejoice in it and, suppose I should have it in me, that I may become like him?” But what need is there to say more? For collecting all the reminiscences about Socrates . . .

¹ See **21a** n. 1; **21g** n. 3; **21l** n. 6. On column 23 see the commentary in Acosta Méndez & Angeli 1992, 228–31.

² The translation “(him)” implies that lines 1–26 “describe the dissembler’s ironic treatment of one particular individual” (Rusten, 193³); note ἐκεῖνος (“that man”) in l. 18; cp. also Ussing 1868, 178. Usually the reference is taken to be non-specific in the sense of “a person, someone.”

³ Rather than “a man like you” (Rusten) or “being the man you are” (Tsouna); cp. n. 4.

⁴ The ironic person presents himself as an older man; the target of his irony apparently is younger, and the point appears to be that younger men tend to despise older men just because of the age difference, but do not say so openly; cp. n. 3.

⁵ The punctuation and the exact reading in l. 19 are disputed: the translation given here is based upon the punctuation first proposed by Hartung and adopted by Ranocchia and Acosta Méndez & Angeli and on Ranocchia’s reading of ἄ[ρ]α instead of δ[ι]ά; with Sauppe’s punctuation and Jensen’s reading, the text reads: “. . . if that man . . . says something like ‘What makes you say that?’ . . .”

⁶ The construction is difficult. In the text as printed here, there is no infinitive as complement to οἷος (“the kind to . . .”); Sauppe’s conjecture would solve that problem. The point of the relative clause appears to be that the ironic person says this to anybody to whom he happens to be talking.

| ἐγὼ Sauppe 34 καὶ Jensen: ἐὰν Sauppe || ως N: ω[O : ὥι, Jensen, A.-A.: ὦ, Sauppe 35 δεῖ[ι τ]ὰ Jensen: δεῖ[ι τὰ] A.A. 36 [ἄπ]αν[τα γ]ὰρ τ[ὰ] Jensen: [ἄπ]αντ[α γ]ὰρ A.-A.: [καὶ γὰρ π]άντ[α τ]ις ἂν τ[ὰ] Sauppe 37 [ἀ]πομνημονεύμα[τ]α Sauppe || [συλ]λέ[γ]ων Jensen: [..]με[..]ων A.-A.: [κατα]-λέγων Sauppe

21o Philodemus, *De vitiis* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 24.1–21 (BT 42–3 Jensen)

14IX W > ————— [όμοι-]
 [οι] δ' εὐτε[λιστῆς ἢ ἐξευτελισ-]
 τῆς καὶ οὐδενωτῆς ἢ ἐξου-
 δενωτῆς κα[ι] ἐπὶ ταὐτὸ φέ-
 ρονται, διαφέρ[ο]ντες ἀνέσει
 5 καὶ ἐπιτάσει [δι]αβολῆς τοῦ
 πλησίον· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐξευτε-
 λιστῆς ἀπὸν[τ]ων τινὰ φανυλό-
 τερον δὴ δοκεῖν παρίστησιν, ὁ
 δ' ἐξουδενωτῆς ἴσον τῷ μη-
 10 δενί· λ[οι]πὸν ἔστιν μὲν ὅτε τοι-
οὔτοί τινές εἰσιν ὑπεροχὴν
ἐμφαίνοντες ἰδίαν ἢ τῶν
οὓς ἀποσεμνύνουσιν, ἔστιν
δ' ὅτε κατὰτρέχοντες μόνον
 15 ἐνίων, ὥστε τοὺς προτέρους
καὶ ὑπερηφάνους εἶναι· διὸ
καὶ δη[λον] ὅτι φησὶν ἐπακο-
λουθε[ῖ]ν αὐτοῖς τὰ [δι'] ἐκείνην
ἄτοπα καὶ περιττότερόν τ[ι]
 20 τῇ διαβλητικ[ῇ] καὶ βασκαν-
τικῇ καὶ φθονητ[ι]κῇ.

[*vid. ad 21a*] 1–2 (ἐξ)ευτελιστῆς: *vid. Knögel 1933, 64* 3 (ἐξ)-
 ουδενωτῆς: *vid. Knögel 1933, 64* 4–5 ἀνέσει | καὶ ἐπιτάσει: *cf. Pl.,*
Resp. I 349E11–12 9–10 ἴσον τῷ μηδενί: *cf. S., OC 918* 11–12
 ὑπεροχὴν—ιδίαν: *cf. 21l.32–3* 17 φησὶν: *vid. ad 21a.10* 19
 ἄτοπα: *cf. 21j.18 et Pl., Tht. 175A7* 20–1 *cf. φθόνος τις καὶ*
βασκανία Divisiones Aristoteleae p. 52,22 Mutschmann II sequitur
21–7 καὶ | τὸν ὑπομνημα[τισ]μὸν δὲ | τοῦτον αὐτοῦ καταπαύσομεν, |
ἐπισυνάγομεν δ' αὐτῷ τὸν | περὶ τῶν ἄλλων κακιῶν ὧν | δοκιμά-
ζομεν ποι[εῖ]σθαι | λόγον. II de subscriptione vid. ad 21a

[*vid. ad 21a*] 1 [παρόμοιοι] *Sauppe* 2 *Caterino* 7 ολ[...]_ι *N*:
 ολι[...]_ι *O*: ο[...]_{ων} *Jensen*: ἀπολείπων *Sauppe*: ἀπολέπων *Hartung*:
 ἀπομειῶν *Ussing* 12 τῶν <καὶ τῶν> *Rusten* 17 δη[...]_{οτι} *φησιν* [...] *επα*
N: δ[.....]_{φησιν} [...] *O*: δ[.....]_ο [...] *φησιν* [...] *Jensen*: φήσομεν *Sauppe*
 18 τα[...] *κεινην NO*: τὰ [περὶ ἐ]κείνην *Sauppe* 19 προ τ[ι] *μαλιτ* ἔτι
Ussing

21o Philodemus, *On Vices* 10, *PHerc.* 1008, col. 24.1–21 (BT 42–3 Jensen)¹

. . . the *disparager* or *utter disparager* and the *vilifier* or *utter vilifier* are similar and tend to the same thing, although they differ in the mildness and intensity of their slander of their neighbor.² For the *utter disparager* presents someone among (those) absent so as to seem rather insignificant, whereas the *utter vilifier* (presents him as) a thing of nought. For the rest, there are moments when they are such people by displaying (their) own superiority or (that) of those whom they extol, and there are moments when (they are such people) merely by running down certain other people. It follows that the former³ are arrogant as well. This, clearly, is also why he (Aristo) says that they are attended by the undesirable consequences of that quality (their arrogance) even to a rather more excessive degree (than the arrogant person) through the slanderous and malicious and envious (nature of their arrogance).⁴

¹ See **21a** n.1 and **21g** n. 3.

² On the “(utter) disparager” [(ἐξ)ευτελιστής] and the “(utter) vilifier” [(ἐξ)ουδενωτής], see Knögel 1933, 37 and Gigante 1997b, 355–6.

³ I.e., the utter disparager and the utter vilifier, as further specified in ll. 11–13.

⁴ In lines 21–7 the book as a whole is rounded off with a closing formula: “And here we shall end this memorandum, and we shall append to it the (memorandum) concerning the other vices of which we think an account ought to be given.” See Philippon 1938, 2468; Gigante 1996b and Dorandi in this volume.

Erotica Homoia? [Ἐρωτικά ὅμοια 22]

vide etiam Athenaeum, *Deipnosophistae* 15.16 674B–C = **10**; 10.14 419A–D = **11**; 2.8 38F–39A = **12**; 13.15–16 563E–564B = **13A**; Eustathium, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* 20.407 = **13B**; Plutarchum, *Aristides* 2.2–6 = **14A**; *Themistocles* 3.1–2 = **14B**.

22 Plutarchus, *Amatorius* 21 766D–F (BT 4.382.15–383.13 Hubert)

21 “ἔτι τοίνυν ἄς λέγουσιν αἰτίας καὶ γενέσεις Ἐρω-
E τος, ἴδιαι μὲν οὐδετέρου γένους εἰσὶ κοιναὶ δ’ ἀμφο-
τέρων. καὶ γὰρ εἰδῶλα δῆπουθεν ἐνδυνόμενα τοῖς ἐρω-
τικοῖς καὶ διατρέχοντα κινεῖν καὶ γαργαλίζειν τὸν
ὄγκον εἰς σπέρμα συνολισθαίνοντα τοῖς ἄλλοις σχη- 5
ματισμοῖς οὐ δυνατόν μὲν ἀπὸ παίδων, ἀδύνατον δ’
21 W ἀπὸ γυναικῶν· καὶ τὰς καλὰς ταύτας καὶ ἱερὰς ἀνα-
μνήσεις †καλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς† ἐπὶ τὸ θεῖον καὶ ἀληθινὸν καὶ
Ὀλύμπιον ἐκεῖνο κάλλος, αἷς ψυχῇ πετροῦται, (. .)
τί (. .) κωλύει γίνεσθαι μὲν ἀπὸ παίδων καὶ ἀπὸ νεα- 10
νίσκων, γίνεσθαι δ’ ἀπὸ παρθένων καὶ γυναικῶν, ὅταν
ἦθος ἀγνὸν καὶ κόσμιον ἐν ὥρᾳ καὶ χάριτι μορφῆς
F διαφανὲς γένηται, καθάπερ ὄρθιον ὑπόδημα δείκνυσι
ποδὸς εὐφυΐαν, ὥς Ἀρίστων ἔλεγεν· (ἦ) ὅταν ἐν εἵδεσι
καλοῖς καὶ καθαροῖς σώμασιν ἵχνη λαμπρᾶς κείμενα 15
ψυχῆς ὀρθὰ καὶ ἄθρυπτα κατίδωσιν οἱ δεινοὶ τῶν τοι-
ούτων αἰσθάνεσθαι;”

4–6 cf. 19 765C; [Plu.], *Plac. phil.* 5 905A; *Epicur. F* 311 *Usener*; *Lucr.* 4.1030–4 7–9 cf. 20 765F; *Pl.*, *Phdr.* 249D 11–14 *Aristo Chius F* 390 *SVF* = *F IV 9 FSA* 13 ὑπόδημα] *Stob.*, *Anth.* 3.1.74; 4.31d.128; [Plu.], *De lib. ed.* 7 4E; *Plu.*, *De tranq.* 4 466F; *Hor.*, *Epist.* 1.10. 42–3 14–17 cf. 4 750D et *D.L.* 7.129 (= *Zeno F* 248 *SVF* = *Chrysipp. F* 716 *SVF*)

[EB] 6–7 ἀδύνατον δὲ EB : [ἀ]δυνατόν δ’ ἀπὸ γυναικῶν; *Leonardos, Hubert, sed vid. Hartman* 1916, 465 : ἀδύνατον δ’ ἀπὸ γυναικῶν; *Helmbold* 7 καὶ¹] καὶ *Bernardakis* 8 †καλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς†] καλουμέν(ας) ἡμᾶς *Wehrli* : καλούσας ἡμᾶς *Patzig* 1876, 62 : (ἀνα)καλουμένας ἡμᾶς *Hubert* : (αἷς ἀνα)καλούμεθ’ ἡμεῖς *dubitanter*

Erotic Examples [*Erotic Examples* 22]

See also Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 15.16 674B–C = **10**; 10.14 419A–D = **11**; 2.8 38F–39A = **12**; 13.15–16 563E–564B = **13A**; Eustathius, *Commentary on Homer's Iliad* 20.407 = **13B**; Plutarch, *Aristides* 2.2–6 = **14A**; *Themistocles* 3.1–2 = **14B**.

- 22** Plutarch, *Dialogue on Love* 21 766D–F (BT 4.382.15–383.13 Hubert)

21 “Now for another point:¹ the causes and origins of Eros that E they (the Epicureans) mention are not peculiar to either one of the sexes but common to both. For in fact, as for images entering into those who are erotically inclined and running through (them) so as to activate and titillate the whole mass (of atoms) into (producing) seed by slipping together with the other configurations (of atoms), it is surely not so that (this process is) possible (as emanating) from boys but impossible from women.² And, what is more, those beautiful and sacred recollections †we call†³ towards that divine and true and Olympian beauty, by which (recollections) the soul is made winged, <. .> what <. .> is there against these originating, on the one hand, from boys and young men and originating, on the other, from maidens and women, whenever a pure and well-ordered character shines through in the youthful beauty and charm of F the outward shape, just as a straight shoe reveals a well-shaped foot, as Aristo said; <or> whenever those who are experts in perceiving such things detect in beautiful forms and pure bodies the presence of traces, straight and undistorted, of a brilliant soul?”⁴

¹ This paragraph is preceded by a substantial lacuna in the text (not indicated in the MSS), in which presumably Zeuxippus, on Epicurean authority, argues that conjugal love is not conducive to real happiness for men, and Plutarch begins a defense of conjugal love. In § 21 Plutarch is in the midst of this.

² The text is needlessly corrected by Hubert (see the *apparatus criticus*). Helmbold retains the reading of the MSS, but is wrong in taking it as a question (“For is it really the case that . . .?”).

³ The text is corrupt, but clearly the idea is that in perceiving beauty of body and mind, one is reminded of and/or led towards real Beauty.

Wilamowitz: <ἀνα>κλωμένας Kronenberg 1924, 89 coll. 765F: <ἄς> ἀνακαλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς coni. Bernardakis: <ἄς> ἀναμνήσεις καλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς Rabinowitz ap. Helmbold 9–10 lac. 1–2 litt. τί lac. 2 litt. E: τί οὖν B: τί <δὴ> Patzig 1876, 62: τί <ἄν> κωλύοι Bernardakis 14 ἢ add. Bernardakis 15 λαμπρᾶς κείμενα Kronenberg 1924, 89: λαμπρὰ καὶ (e compendio ζ) κείμενα EB: λαμπρὰ κείμενα Bachet de Meziriac: λαμπρὰ καὶ σημεία ψυχῆς ὀρθὰ Leonardos 16 ἄθρυπτα Stephanus: θρυπτά EB

Vitae Philosophorum?

vide etiam Plutarchum, *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat* 1 14E = **15**; Diogenem Laertium, *Vitae philosophorum* 5.61; 64 = **16**.

De Heraclito [Περὶ Ἡρακλείτου **23–4**]

23 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 9.5 (BT 1.635.4–11 Marcovich)

5 γέγονε δὲ θαυμάσιος ἐκ παίδων, ὅτε καὶ νέος ὢν
 ἔφασκε μηδὲν εἰδέναι, τέλειος μέντοι γενόμενος πάντα
 ἐγνοῦναι· ἤκουσέ τε οὐδενός, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν ἔφη διζή-
 28 W σασθαι καὶ μαθεῖν πάντα παρ' ἑαυτοῦ. Σωτίων δέ φη-
 σιν εἰρηκέναι τινὰς Ξενοφάνους αὐτὸν ἀκκοῦναι· 5
 λέγειν τε Ἀρίστωναν ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ἡρακλείτου καὶ τὸν
 ὕδρον αὐτὸν θεραπευθῆναι, ἀποθανεῖν δ' ἄλλῃ νό-
 σφ. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ Ἰππόβοτος φησι.

cf. **24A–B, 25** 1–8 Heracl. 22 A 1 DK 1.140.21–7 = A 1 Mondolfo 1–3 Heracl. F 15(a⁴) Marcovich 1–2 cf. Gnom. Vat. 310 Sternbach (= F 15(a³) Marcovich); Stob., Anth. 3.21.7 (= F 15(a²) Marcovich); Ps.-Max. 49.21/56.23 Ihm; Anton. 1.59 960C 3–8 Sotion F 30 Wehrli; Hippobotus F 20 Gigante 3–4 ἤκουσέ—ἑαυτοῦ] Ps.-Hsch. Mil. 34 (BT 2.112.4–6 Marcovich); Suda η 472 s.v. Ἡράκλειτος (LG 1.2.583.27–8 Adler = F 15(d⁵) Marcovich); Heracl. F 15(d²) Marcovich || αὐτὸν ἔφη διζήσασθαι] cf. Plu., Adv. Col. 20 1118C (= Heracl. 22 B 101 DK = F 15(a) Marcovich); cf. **25.2–3** 4–8 Aristo Ceus F 19 Knögel; Aristo Chius Ioppolo 1980, 331 (“testimonianze mancanti negli SVF”) 6–7 τὸν ὕδρον] cf. 9.3

[BPF = Ω = hyparchetypon; D = Neapolitanus Bourbonicus III B 28,

⁴ This passage is included as a fragment of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli (but not by Knögel); as one of Aristo of Chios by Arnim. On this fragment, see Wehrli on F 21 p. 63; Ioppolo 1980, 30–2. It is taken to refer to Aristo of Chios by Mayer 1907–10, 569–72; Edelstein 1955, 416; Lancia 1980, 289–90⁵⁰; Ioppolo 1980, 330; and Hahm in this volume; Tsekourakis 1980, 242–8 argues for Aristo of Ceos; Zeller 1921, 927³ and Gigon 1959, 72 withhold judgment.

Lives of the Philosophers?

See also Plutarch, *How a Young Man Ought to Study Poetry* 1 14E = **15**; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 5.61; 64 = **16**.

On Heraclitus [*On Heraclitus* **23–4**]

23 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 9.5 (BT 1.635.4–11 Marcovich)

5 He (Heraclitus) was from boyhood an amazing person, seeing that even as a young man he claimed not to know anything, whereas when he had grown up, (he claimed) to have gotten to know everything. And he heard nobody (lecturing), but said that he had searched himself, and learned everything by himself. Sotion, however, says that some have stated that he had heard Xenophanes, and (Sotion says) that Aristo in his (book) *On Heraclitus* declares that he was cured of the dropsy and died of another illness. That is what Hippobotus says too.¹

¹ This passage is part of the *Life of Heraclitus* and is included as a fragment of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli and Knögel, as one of Aristo of Chios by Ioppolo (but not by Arnim). On this fragment (and **24A–B**), see Knögel 1933, 76–8; Wehrli on F 28–32 p. 65–6; Mondolfo on Heraclitus A 1 p. 24²⁰; Philippson 1934, 1333; Ioppolo 1980, “I frammenti di controversa attribuzione: Le Biografie di Epicuro e di Eraclito,” 316–21; Mouraviev 1987; Gigante 1996a; Hahm in this volume; cp. also Kirk, *Heraclitus* 6; Jacoby 1902, 356⁵ and Crönert, *KuM*, 175²¹ take it to refer to Aristo of Ceos.

saec. XV; *Ph* = *Vaticanus* gr. 96, f. 19^r–29^v, saec. XII = *Ps.-Hsch. Mil.*] 2 ἔφασκε δὲ *F* || εἰδέναι *D*: εἶναι *Ω* 3 ἤκουσέ τ' οὐδενός] οὗτος ἐμαθήτευσεν οὐδενὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων *Suda* || αὐτὸν *Stephanus*: αὐτὸν *Ω*: αὐτὸς *Ph* 3–4 ἀλλ' αὐτὸν—ἐαυτοῦ] φύσει δὲ καὶ ἐπιμελείᾳ ἡσκήθη *Suda* || διζήσασθαι *Casaubon e Plu.*, *Adv. Col.* 20 1118C: διζήσεσθαι *Ω*: διαζήσεσθαι *B*²: δίξεσθαι *Ph* 5 τινὰς *BP*: αὐτὸν *F* 8 ἱππόβωτος *F*

24A Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 9.11–12 (BT 1.639. 1–7 Marcovich)

29 W τὰ δὲ περὶ Σωκράτους καὶ ὅσα ἐντυχὼν τῷ συγ-
γράμματι εἴποι, κομίσαντος Εὐριπίδου, καθὰ φησιν
12 Ἀρίστων, ἐν τῷ περὶ Σωκράτους εἰρήκαμεν. Σέλευκος
μέντοι ὁ γραμματικός φησι Κρότωνά τινα ἱστορεῖν ἐν τῷ
Κατακυμβητῇ Κράτητά τινα πρῶτον εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα 5
κομίσαι τὸ βιβλίον, καὶ εἰπεῖν Δηλίου τινὸς δεῖσθαι
κυμβητοῦ, ὃς οὐκ ἀποπνιγήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ.

cf. **23, 24B, 25** 1–7 *Heracl.* 22 A 1 *DK* 1.142.12–17 = A 1 *Mondolfo* 1–3 *Aristo Ceus F* 20 *Knögel*; *Aristo Chius Ioppolo* 1980, 331 (“testimonianze mancanti negli SVF”); *Socrates I C* 21 *SSR* 1.49 *Giannantoni* 1–2 et 6–7 *Suda* δ 400 s.v. Δηλίου κυμβητοῦ (*LG* 1.2.37.20–2 et 25–9 *Adler*) 3 εἰρήκαμεν] *vid.* **24B** 3–7 *Seleucus F* 74 *Müller p.* 50–1 5 Κράτητα] cf. *Zoumpos* 1964 (*Crates* = *Cratylus*?) 6–7 cf. *Apost.* 5.100 p. 364 6 Δηλίου] *vid.* ad **24B.4**

[*BPF* = *Ω* = *hyparchetypon*] 4 ἱστορεῖ *F* 5 κράτητα *FP*⁴: κράτη *BP*¹ 6 βιβλίον *BF*: βιβλίον ὃν *P* || καὶ ἑκείνον) (*i.e.* *Socratem*) *Marcovich*; *vid.* **24B** 6–7 *vid. app.* **24B**

24B Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 2.22 (BT 1.107.3–6 Marcovich)

30 W φασὶ δ' Εὐριπίδην αὐτῷ δόντα τὸ Ἡρακλείτου
σύγγραμμα ἐρέσθαι· “τί δοκεῖ;” τὸν δὲ φάναι· “ἂ μὲν
συνήκα, γενναῖα· οἶμαι δὲ καὶ ἂ μὴ συνήκα· πλὴν

24A Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 9.11–12 (BT 1.639.1–7 Marcovich)

We have mentioned in our (section) on Socrates the story about Socrates and everything he said when he came upon the treatise (of 12 Heraclitus), which Euripides brought (him), as Aristo says. However, the grammarian Seleucus says that a certain Croton reports in his (book entitled) *The Diver* that one Crates was the first to bring the book into Greece,¹ and that he² said it required a Delian diver not to be suffocated in it.³

¹ The book is entitled *On Nature* or *Muses*.

² I.e., Crates. Although comparison with **24B** clearly suggests that Socrates was the one to make this statement, the Greek as it stands does not seem to admit of such an interpretation (“but the infinitive εἰπεῖν in this case is difficult” Kirk, *Heraclitus*, 10), although DK p. 142 and Mondolfo p. 11 take it that way with the text as it stands (cp. the conjecture of Marcovich); cp. Brunschwig 1999, 1055⁴.

³ This passage is part of the *Life of Heraclitus* and is included as a fragment of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli and Knögel, as one of Aristo of Chios by Ioppolo (but not by Arnim). See Ioppolo 1980, “I frammenti di controversa attribuzione: Le Biografie di Epicuro e di Eraclito,” 316–21; see further **23** n. 1. Jacoby 1902, 356⁵ and Crönert, *KuM*, 175²¹ take it to refer to Aristo of Ceos.

24B Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 2.22 (BT 1.107.3–6 Marcovich)

They say that Euripides, after giving him (Socrates) the treatise of Heraclitus, asked, “What is your opinion (of it)?”, and that he (Socrates) said, “What I understand is excellent, and I think also what I do not understand; except, that is, that it requires a

Δηλίου γέ τινος δεῖται κολυμβητοῦ.”

cf. **23, 24A, 25** 1–4 *Aristo Ceus F 21 Knögel; Aristo Chius Ioppolo 1980, 331* (“*testimonianze mancanti negli SVF*”); *Heracl. 22 A 4 DK 1.145.4–6 = A 4 Mondolfo; Suda δ 400 s.v. Δηλίου κολυμβητοῦ (LG 1.2.37.25–9 Adler); Socrates I D 1 SSR 1.213 Giannantoni 4 Doxopater Rhet. Gr. 2.226.5 Walz*

[*vid. ad 24A; Φ = epitome Laertii Diogenis in cod. Vaticano gr. 96, f. 29^v–88^r, saec. XII (BT 2.219.1–4 Marcovich)*] 1 φασί—‘*Ἡρακλείτου*] *Εὐριπίδου δόντος αὐτῷ τὸ ‘Ἡρακλείτου Φ: Σωκράτει γὰρ δόντος τοῦ Εὐριπίδου ‘Ἡρακλείτου τοῦ Σκοτεινοῦ Suda 2 ἐρέσθαι*] καὶ ἐρομένου *Φ* || τί σοι δοκεῖ *Φ* || τὸν δὲ φάναι] εἶπεν *Φ 4 δηλίου PF et Suda (cf. Crusius 1889): δ’ ἡλίου B: δεινοῦ Nauck Bull. Acad. St.-Pétersbourg 30 (1886), 114⁵⁹ (= Mél. Gr.-R. 5, 226⁵⁹); vid. etiam 1889, 458: βαθέος Doxopater || γέ τινος om. Suda: αὐτοῦ τὰ συγγράμματα Doxopater || post κολυμβητοῦ pergīt Suda εἰς τὸ μὴ ἀποπνιγῆναι ἐν αὐτῷ; vid. 24A.7*

Vita Epicuri [Βίος Ἐπικούρου **25**]

25 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 10.13–14 (BT 1. 718.10–719.15 Marcovich)

13 τοῦτον Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν Χρονικοῖς Ναυσιφάνους ἀκοῦσαι φησι καὶ Πραξιφάνους· αὐτὸς δὲ οὐ φησιν, ἀλλ’ ἐαυτοῦ, ἐν τῇ πρὸς Εὐρύλοχον ἐπιστολῇ. ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ Λεύκιππὸν τινα γεγενῆσθαι φησι φιλόσοφον, οὐτε αὐτὸς οὔτε Ἑρμαρχος, ὃν ἐνιοί φασι καὶ Ἀπολλό- 5 δωρος ὁ Ἐπικούρειος διδάσκαλον Δημοκρίτου γεγενῆσθαι. Δημήτριος δὲ φησιν ὁ Μάγνης καὶ Ξενοκράτους αὐτὸν ἀκοῦσαι.

κέχρηται δὲ λέξει κυρία κατὰ τῶν πραγμάτων, ἣν ὅτι ἰδιωτάτη ἐστίν, Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικὸς αἰτι- 10 ᾶται. σαφὴς δ’ ἦν οὕτως, ὥς καὶ ἐν τῷ Περὶ ῥητορικῆς 14 ἀξιοῖ μηδὲν ἄλλο ἢ σαφένειαν ἀπαιτεῖν. καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς ἀντὶ τοῦ “χαίρειν” “εὖ πράττειν” καὶ “σπουδαίως ζῆν.”

32 W Ἀρίστων [οἱ] δὲ φησιν ἐν τῷ Ἐπικούρου βίῳ τὸν 15 Κανόνα γράψαι αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ Ναυσιφάνους Τρίποδος, οὗ καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φησιν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Παμφίλου τοῦ

Delian diver.”¹

¹ This passage is part of the *Life of Socrates* and is included as a fragment of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli and Knögel, as one of Aristo of Chios by Ioppolo (but not by Arnim). See further the notes on **24A**.

Life of Epicurus [*Life of Epicurus* **25**]

25 Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* 10.13–14 (BT 1. 718.10–719.15 Marcovich)¹

13 Of him (Epicurus) Apollodorus in (his) *Chronicles* says that he had gone to hear Nausiphanes and Praxiphanes.² He himself, in his *Letter to Eurylochus*, denies this, but (says) on the contrary (that he listened only) to himself. But for that matter, he also denies — both he himself and Hermarchus³ (deny this) — that there was ever a philosopher Leucippus, the man (whom) Apollodorus the Epicurean as well as certain others affirm was the teacher of Democritus.⁴ Demetrius of Magnesia says that he (Epicurus) had also gone to hear Xenocrates.

He (Epicurus) applies ordinary speech to things, which Aristophanes the grammarian criticizes as being very idiosyncratic. He was so clear (a writer) that even in his (work) *On Rhetoric* he
14 deems it right to demand nothing other than clarity. In his letters too, instead of (the formula) “Joy to you” (he used the formulae) “Fare well”⁵ and “Live worthily.”

Aristo in his *Life of Epicurus* says⁶ that he wrote *The Canon*⁷ after the *Tripod* of Nausiphanes,⁸ whom he (Aristo) says he (Epi-

Πλατωνικοῦ ἐν Σάμῳ. ἄρξασθαί τε φιλοσοφεῖν ἐτῶν ὑπάρχοντα δυοκαίδεκα, ἀφηγήσασθαι δὲ τῆς σχολῆς ἐτῶν ὄντα δύο πρὸς τοῖς τριάκοντα.

20

ἐγεννήθη δέ, φησὶν Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν Χρονικοῖς, κατὰ τὸ τρίτον ἔτος ἐνάτης καὶ ἑκατοστῆς Ὀλυμπιάδος ἐπὶ Σωσιγένους ἄρχοντος, μηνὸς Γαμηλιῶνος ἐβδόμῃ, ἔτεσιν ὕστερον τῆς Πλάτωνος τελευτῆς ἐπτά.

cf. **23, 24A–B** 1–24 *Epicur. Usener p.* 365.19–366.18; *F 1 Arrighetti p.* 11.10–31; *Laks 1976, p.* 14.25–16.17 1–7 *Leucipp. 67 A 2 DK* 1–3 *Epicur. F 123 Usener; F 48 Arrighetti; Nausiph. 75 A 8 DK; Praxiphanes F 5 Wehrli* 1–2 *Apollod. 244 F 41 FGrH = F 75 Jacoby* 2 *Πραξιφάνους* cf. **4A.3** 3 ἄλλ' ἐαυτοῦ] cf. *S.E., Adv. math. 1.3–4 (= Epicur. F 114 Usener)*; cf. **23.3–4** || *Εὐρύλοχον*] cf. 10.28 *Εὐρύλοχος πρὸς Μητρόδωρον* 3–7 *Epicur. F 232 Usener* 3–5 *Hermarchus F 50 Krohn = 13 Longo* 5–6 Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ Ἐπικούρειος] *vid. DNP 1 (1996) 860–1 [10]* 7–8 *Demetr. Magn. F 31 Mejer; cf. Cic., N.D. 1.26.72* 9–12 *Epicur. Usener p.* 88 9–11 *Ar. Byz. F 404 Slater* 11–12 *Epicur. F 54 Usener* 12–14 *Epicur. F 95 Usener; cf. 3.61; Luc., Laps. 6 et 21h.14–17* 13 χαίρειν] cf. 10.34; 83; 121a *et 21h.15* 15–20 *Aristo Ceus F 22 Knögel; Aristo Chius Ioppolo 1980, 331 ("testimonianze mancanti negli SVF")*; *Pamphilus T 2 Lasserre* 15–19 *Nausiphanes 75 A 6 DK* 15–17 *Epicur. Usener p.* 104 15–16 τὸν Κανόνα] *vid. Usener p.* 104–6 18–24 cf. *Suda ε 2404 s.v. Ἐπικούρος (LG 1.2.362.21–7 Adler)* 21–4 *Apollod. 244 F 42 FGrH = F 76 Jacoby* 22–3 κατὰ—ἄρχοντος] *i.e., a. 342–1* 24 τῆς Πλάτωνος τελευτῆς] cf. 3.2 (= *Apollod. 244 F 37 FGrH*)

[*vid. ad 1; 8; Q = Parisinus gr. 1758, saec. XIV ineunte*] 1 ναυσιφάνους *BP¹Q*: λυσιφάνους *FP⁴ ss. γρ.* 2 καὶ πραξιφάνους *secl. Jacoby 1902, 354–5³ et Crönert, KuM 21* 3 ἄλλ' ἐν τῇ ἐαυτοῦ *F* || *Εὐρύλοχον Menagius (Hübner, Comm. 2.520) coll. 10.28: εὐρύδοκον BFP⁴: εὐρύλοκον P¹Q* 4 φησι *om. F* 6 ἐπικούρειος *PF*: ἐπικούρου *B* 10 ἰδιω(τικω)τάτη *Menagius (Hübner, Comm. 2.521)* 12 ἀπαιτεῖν] ἀσκεῖν *Cobet*: ἀπαιτῶν *malit Usener 366* 13–14 ἀντὶ τοῦ χαίρειν εὖ πράττειν *Ω (errat Marcovich)*: ἀντὶ τοῦ εὖ πράττειν χαίρειν *M. Gigante 1961, coll. 3.61* 14 ζῆν (ἔγραφεν) *Marcovich; post 13 χαίρειν deesse γράφει iudicat Usener 366* 14–15 ζῆν ἄριστον· οἱ δὲ φασιν *Ω*: ζῆν. Ἀρίστων δὲ φησιν *Cobet deleto οἱ (cf. Crönert, KuM 21¹¹³ "Das οἱ der Hss. entstammt einem übergeschriebenen ω")*: Ἀντίγονος δὲ φησιν *Usener 366*: Ἀρίστων ὁ Ἰ*** (Ἐπικούρειος?) δὲ φησιν *Susemihl GGL 1.101⁴⁵⁶*: Ἀρίστων ὁ Ἰουλήτης] δὲ φησιν *Jacoby 1902, 356⁵*: ζῆν Ἀρίστων. οἱ δὲ φασιν *Laks 1976, 16*: [ἄριστον]. οἱ δὲ φασιν *Philippson 1921, qui 15–20 post Πραξιφάνους 2 transposuit et [ἄριστον] pro scholio habet* 19 δὲ *om. F* 21 ἐν Χρονικοῖς *om. F*

curus) had also gone to hear, as he had (gone to hear) the Platonist Pamphilus in Samos. And that he (Epicurus) had started to study philosophy at twelve years of age, and became the leader of his school at thirty-two years of age.⁹

He was born, as Apollodorus in his *Chronicles* has it, in the third year of the 109th Olympiad during the archonship of Sosigenes, on the seventh day of the month Gamelion,¹⁰ seven years after the death of Plato.

¹ This passage is part of the *Life of Epicurus*. See the commentaries of Arrighetti p. 487–8 and Laks 1976, 66–77.

² On this problematic reference to Praxiphanes, see Laks 1976, 66–8.

³ Pupil and successor of Epicurus.

⁴ On the interpretation of this sentence, see Laks 1976, 69–71.

⁵ On the formulas for opening a letter, see Gerhard 1905, 38–44. In 3.61 Diogenes has mentioned that Plato uses the formula “Fare well (*eu prattein*),” Epicurus “Pass your life well (*eu diagein*)” and Cleon “Joy to you (*chairein*).” The three letters of Epicurus preserved by Diogenes Laertius all open with the formula “Joy to you (*chairein*)” (10.34; 83; 121a); for that reason Gigante 1961 changed the order into “instead of ‘Fare well’ ‘Joy to you’.” See Laks 1976, 74–5. On ll. 9–14, see Acosta Méndez 1983. It would appear that this second paragraph has been inserted in a context where it does not belong and that the original text had the third and fourth paragraphs (ll. 15–24) following immediately after the first paragraph (ll. 1–8). See also next note.

⁶ The text of the MSS reads “And in his letters instead of ‘Joy to you’ ‘Fare well’ and ‘Live well’ (is?) best [*ariston*]. Others say in the *Life of Epicurus* that . . .” The translation follows Cobet, who changed *ariston* into *Aristôn* = Aristo, and the plural “say” into a singular “says” (with the “says” in l. 17 also referring to Aristo). Most editors follow Cobet. Laks 1976, 75–6 keeps *Aristôn* and the plural “they say,” but takes “Aristo” with what precedes: “. . . and Aristo <uses the formula> ‘Live well.’ Others say that . . .,” with the singular “says” in l. 17 referring to Epicurus. Philippson 1921 deletes *ariston* as a marginal note of approval, keeps the plural “they say,” but moves ll. 15–20 so as to follow after the words “Of him . . . and Praxiphanes” in ll. 1–2, the singular in l. 17 referring to Apollodorus. See Laks 1976, 75–6 and previous note.

⁷ Epicurus’ lost work on epistemology.

⁸ Nausiphanes of Teos, a Democritean philosopher (*fl. ca.* 340–320 BC), apparently wrote a tripartite (epistemological) work on philosophy.

⁹ This passage is included as a fragment of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli and Knögel (cp. Jacoby 1902, 356⁵ and Crönert *KuM* 175²¹), as one of Aristo of Chios by Ioppolo (but not by Arnim); cp. Laks 1976, 76. See Wehrli on Aristo F 32 p. 66 and Ioppolo 1980, “I frammenti di controversa attribuzione: Le Biografie di Epicuro e di Eraclito,” 312–16.

¹⁰ I.e., January/February; the seventh day would be in the second half of January. Plato died in 347 B.C.

Fragmenta incertae sedis

vide etiam Paradoxographum Florentinum, *Mirabilia de aquis* 24–7 = **17A**; Vitruvium, *De architectura* 8.3.21–3 = **17B**; Paradoxographum Vaticanum 33 = **17C**; Plinium, *Naturalis Historia* 31.15–16 = **17D**.

- 26** Plutarchus, *De curiositate* 3 516E–517A (BT 3.315.12–316.3 Paton et al.)

καίτοι μὴ κόψαντά γε θύραν εἰς οἰκίαν ἀλλοτρίαν οὐ νομίζεται παρελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ νῦν μὲν εἰσὶ θυρωροί, πάλαι δὲ ῥόπτρα κρουόμενα πρὸς ταῖς θύραις αἴσθησιν παρείχεν, ἵνα μὴ τὴν οἰκοδέσποιναν ἐν μέσῳ καταλάβῃ ὁ ἀλλότριος ἢ τὴν παρθένον ἢ κολαζόμενον οἰκ-
 5 ἔτην ἢ κεκραγυίας τὰς θεραπαινίδας· ὁ δὲ πολυπράγμων ἐπ’ αὐτὰ ταῦτα παραδύεται, σῶφρονος μὲν οἰκίας καὶ καθεστῶσης οὐδ’ ἂν παρακαλῇ τις ἡδέως γινόμενος θεατῆς, ὧν δ’ ἔνεκα κλείς καὶ μοχλὸς καὶ αὐλεις, ταῦτ’ ἀνακαλύπτων καὶ φέρων εἰς τὸ μέσον ἑτέροις.
 10 καίτοι καὶ “τῶν ἀνέμων μάλιστα δυσχεραίνομεν” ὡς Ἀρίστων φησίν, “ὅσοι τὰς περιβολὰς ἀναστέλλουσιν ἡμῶν”· ὁ δὲ πολυπράγμων οὐ τὰ ἱμάτια τῶν πέλας οὐδὲ τοὺς χιτῶνας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς τοίχους ἀπαμφιέννυσι, τὰς θύρας ἀναπετάννυσι, καὶ “διὰ παρθενικῆς ἀπα-
 15 λόχροος” ὡς πνεῦμα διαδύεται καὶ διέρπει, βακχεῖα καὶ χοροὺς καὶ παννυχίδας ἐξετάζων καὶ συκοφαντῶν.

11–18 *Aristo Ceus F 25 Knögel* 11–15 *Aristo Chius F 401 SVF* = *F V 6 FSA* 12 *περιβολὰς*] cf. **211.12** 16 *Hes., Op. 519* (cf. *De tranq. 2 465D*)

[*LCGWXΛυ(V)JKYNMαADRShiZa; Σ = DRShi; Π = αA; Δ = DΘ*] 4 post μέσῳ excidisse “*aliquod in quo se deprehendi pudica nolit mulier*” putat Hartman 1916, 289 8 καὶ om. WΔΔ 8–9 γενόμενος C(L?)WX¹υKYMPIΣZ

Fragments of Uncertain Provenance

See also Florentine Paradoxographer, *Wonderful Facts About Waters* 24–7 = **17A**; Vitruvius, *On Architecture* 8.3.21–3 = **17B**; Vatican Paradoxographer 33 = **17C**; Pliny, *Natural History* 31.15–16 = **17D**.

- 26** Plutarch, *On Being a Busybody* 3 516E–517A (BT 3.315.12–316.3 Paton *et al.*)

And yet,¹ though it is not considered good form to walk into the house of someone else without at least having knocked on the door—no, there are doormen nowadays as in times of old (there were) knockers (which) being struck against the door gave notice, so that the stranger might not catch the mistress of the house in the middle of it² or the unmarried daughter, or a slave in the process of being punished or the servant girls in a screaming fit —, which is exactly why the busybody intrudes: to have a look inside a controlled and settled household would not be a pleasure, not even if one invites (him), but to reveal and bring out for others to see the things for which we have keys and bolts and streetdoors. And yet, though “the winds which cause us the greatest vexation,” as Aristo says, “are those which pull up the garments with which we cover up ourselves,” the busybody does not divest those around him of their cloaks and tunics, but of their walls; he flings their doors open, and like a gust of wind “through a maiden’s tender skin,” he
517 dives in and makes his way through (the house), searching (the place) for drinking and dancing and all-night partying and hoping to use that against (the inhabitants).³

¹ In the preceding sentence Plutarch asks “Why try to put your nose into things that are hidden? For a thing would not be hidden, unless it is something bad.”

² I.e., in a compromising situation.

³ This passage is included as a fragment of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli and Knögel, as one of Aristo of Chios by Arnim. It is taken to refer to Aristo of Chios by Hense 1890; Edelstein 1955, 416. See also Hahm in this volume.

27 Plutarchus, *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae* 10 804C–E (BT 5.1.74.18–75.8 Hubert)

- 25 W 10 εἰσβολαὶ δὲ καὶ ὁδοὶ δύο τῆς πολιτείας εἰσὶν, ἡ
 μὲν ταχεῖα καὶ λαμπρὰ πρὸς δόξαν οὐ μὴν ἀκίνδυνος,
 ἡ δὲ πεζοτέρα καὶ βραδυτέρα τὸ δ' ἀσφαλὲς ἔχουσα
 D μᾶλλον. οἱ μὲν γὰρ εὐθὺς ὥσπερ ἐξ ἄκρας πελαγίου
 πράξεως ἐπιφανοῦς καὶ μεγάλης ἐχούσης δὲ τόλμαν 5
 ἄραντες ἀφῆκαν ἐπὶ τὴν πολιτείαν, ἡγούμενοι λέγειν
 ὀρθῶς τὸν Πίνδαρον ὥς
 “ἀρχομένου δ' ἔργου πρόσωπον
 χρὴ θέμεν τηλαυγές”·
 καὶ γὰρ δέχονται προθυμότερον οἱ πολλοὶ κόρῳ τινὶ 10
 καὶ πλησμονῇ τῶν συνήθων τὸν ἀρχόμενον, ὥσπερ
 ἀγωνιστὴν θεαταί, καὶ τὸν φθόνον ἐκπλήττουσιν αἱ
 λαμπρὰν ἔχουσai καὶ ταχεῖαν αὕξησιν ἀρχαὶ καὶ δυνά-
 μεις. οὐτε γὰρ πῦρ φησιν ὁ Ἀρίστων καπνὸν ποιεῖν οὐτε 15
 δόξαν φθόνον, ἣν εὐθὺς ἐκλάμψη καὶ ταχέως, ἀλλὰ
 τῶν κατὰ μικρὸν αὐξανομένων καὶ σχολαίως ἄλλον
 E ἀλλαχόθεν ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι· διὸ πολλοὶ πρὶν ἀνθῆσαι
 περὶ τὸ βῆμα κατεμαράνθησαν.

8–9 *Pi. O.* 6.3–4 14–17 *Aristo Ceus F 15 Knögel; Aristo Chius F 402 SVF = F IV 18 FSA; cf. Stob. Anth.* 3.38.31 (= *Plu., Fragm.* 154 *Sandbach*); *Plu., An seni* 7 787E

[oGVk(g)v^{ll}vd^lzFJScd^{ll}RyαAE(β)ZBv^ln; Φ = v^{ll}vd^lz; Σ = Scd^{ll}; Π = αAE; Θ = ZBv^l] 2 τραχεῖα Gd^lVk 6 αἴραντες ο: δραμόντες Φ 7 ὥς om. J^lΣ 8 δ' om. oFJΣRynΠΘ 9 θέμεναι v^{ll} manus 2 ΣRyΘ 12 φθόνον ὥσπερ ἐκπλήττουσιν GVk 16 αὐξομένων Ry

27 Plutarch, *Precepts of Statecraft* 10 804C-E (BT 5.1.74.18–75.8 Hubert)

10 There are two ways of entering politics: the one quick and brilliant (leading) towards fame, but certainly not without risk; the other more pedestrian and slower, but having the advantage over the first in safety. That is to say, those who take the first course straightway launch out into politics by “lifting anchor,” as if from a promontary in the open sea, from a conspicuous and momentous action which shows daring, since they believe that Pindar is right in saying that

“when action starts, one must put on
a face that shines afar.”

For it is a fact that the masses are inclined to welcome with more enthusiasm a beginner because they are in a way satiated and fed up with the customary faces, just as spectators at a show (welcome) a (new) contestant; and, what is more, whenever a tenure of office and a position of power stand out by a brilliant and quick rise, this drives away envy. For Aristo says that neither does fire cause smoke, nor fame envy, if it blazes up straightway and quickly, but that it is with those who rise by small and leisurely steps, that different people are likely to attack them from different sides. This is why many, before coming to full bloom around the speaker’s stand, have withered away.¹

¹ In § 11 Plutarch mentions some politicians who have followed the more cautious course. Men of this type usually attach themselves to an older man of reputation and grow great under the shelter of his power. In this context, Plutarch mentions Agesilaus, who was helped in this way by Lysander, and briefly refers to the manner in which Agesilaus broke with Lysander (805F), an anecdote also related in Philodemus, *On Vices* (21f.8–12); see Mayer 1907–10, 500–1; Jensen 1911, 403–4 and Knögel 1933, 85–6.

This passage is included as a fragment of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli and Knögel, as one of Aristo of Chios by Arnim. On this fragment, see Knögel on F 15 p. 85; Ioppolo 1980, 323–4¹⁰³. It is taken to refer to Aristo of Ceos by Mayer 1907–10, 490; Jensen 1911, 403–4; to Aristo of Chios by Edelstein 1955, 416; Philippson 1934, 1333. According to Zeller 1921, 927³ it is impossible to decide between the two.

- 28** Varro, *Logistoricus: Catus De liberis educandis* ap. Nonium 308 M.32–7 (BT 2.481.9–14 Lindsay)

F i n g e r e, parare. Lucilius lib. XXVIII:

... sed fuga fíngitur. timidó vadit pede pércitus.

- 27 W Varro Cato vel de liberis educandis: “magnum est enim, ut Ariston scribit, in primordio pueruli. quemadmodum incipiat fingi, ad id quasi evadat.” 5

2 *Lucil.* 28.1 F 748 Krenkel 3–5 *Varro* F 9 Riese; cf. *Pl., Resp.* 2 377A11–B2 et C3–5; *Arist., Pol.* 1336b33–5; *Stob., Anth.* 2.31.87 5 fingi] cf. *Ter., Heaut.* 898

[*GLB, Gen., Cant., HP, Bern.* 347 et 357, *Montepess., E, Oxon.*; a = fons codicum B *Gen.* (unde *Cant., HP*); d = fons codicum *Bern.* 347 et 357, *Montepess., Oxon.*] 2 fungitur *L*¹a || <ac>timido *Acidalius*: <ut>timido *L. Müller*: <ét>timidó *Krenkel* || tumido *ad* 5 evadet *Riese*

- *29** Porphyrius, *De animae facultatibus* ap. Stobaeum 1.49.24 (1.347.21–348.10 Wachsmuth)

τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις ὑπογράψαι πρόκειται· καὶ πρότερόν γε ἐπεξελθὼν τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τῇ τε παρὰ τοῖς παλαιοῖς καὶ τῇ ὕστερον ἐπικριθείσῃ παρὰ τοῖς διδασκάλοις, Ἀρίστων ἀντιληπτικὴν δύναντα τῆς ψυχῆς θέμενος ταύτην διαιρεῖ εἰς δύο, τὸ μὲν τι μέρος φάσκων μετὰ τινος τῶν αἰσθητηρίων ὡς τὰ πολλὰ κινεῖσθαι, ὃ αἰσθητικὸν καλεῖ, ἀρχὴν καὶ πηγὴν ὑπάρχον τῶν κατὰ μέρος αἰσθήσεων, τὸ δὲ αἰεὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸ καὶ χωρὶς ὀργάνων, ὃ ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων οὐκ ὠνομάσθαι (ἢ γὰρ ὅλως οὐκ εἶναι ἐν αὐτοῖς ἢ τελέως ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀμυδρὸν ἄγαν), ἐν δὲ τοῖς λογικοῖς, ἐν οἷς δὴ μάλιστα (ἢ) μόνοις φαίνεται, νοῦν προσαγορεύεσθαι. [ἔφη ἄνευ 5 10

- 28** Varro, *Logistoricus: Catus On the Education of Children* in Nonius 308 M.32–7 (BT 2.481.9–14 Lindsay)¹

“F i n g e r e [form, mould]” in the sense of “parare [fix, prepare]”: Lucilius Book 28:

... but flight is being prepared [fingitur]. With timid foot
he rushes in great haste.

Varro in *Catus* or *On the Education of Children*: “For much depends, as Aristo writes, on the very first beginning of a little boy. In the manner in which he begins to be formed [fingi], thus he is likely to turn out.”²

¹ On the meaning of *logistoricus* see Gottschalk 1980, 360–1. *Catus* (“clever, intelligent”; Greek equivalent ἔμπειρος) is used as a cognomen by the *gens Aelia*. Possibly the cognomen is used here to refer to the famous lawyer and historian Q. Aelius Tubero (*DNP* 1 [1996] 171 [I 17]), son of L. Aelius Tubero (*DNP* 1 [1996] 170–1 [I 14]). See Müller 1938, 15–28; Dahlmann 1956; Zucchelli 1981, 37–42.

² This passage is included as a fragment of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli (but not by Knögel, who p. 87¹ prefers Aristo of Chios); it is not included in the fragments of Aristo of Chios by Arnim and Ioppolo. It is taken to refer to Aristo of Ceos by Gercke *RE*, 955; Mayer 1907–10, 487; Müller 1938, 55–7. Gottschalk 1980 and Dahlmann 1941, 182 argue for Aristo of Chios.

- *29** Porphyry, *On the Faculties of the Soul* in Stobaeus 1.49.24 (1.347.21–348.10 Wachsmuth)¹

To give an outline of the faculties of the soul is the task before us.² Having in fact addressed himself critically even before to the research both (as found) in the ancients and as later accredited in his teachers, Aristo posits an apprehensive faculty of the soul which he analyzes into two (parts). He says that one of these parts, which he calls the sense faculty, is mostly moved along with one of the sense-organs, and is the starting-point and source of the various sense-perceptions. The other (part, he says,) is always by itself and separate from (all) organs. This latter part (according to Aristo) does not have a name in the case of the other living beings (for either it is not in them at all or it is quite weak and all too dim), but in the beings gifted with reason and speech, in whom as we know it manifests itself most <or rather> exclusively, it is labeled “mind” [*nous*].³ [He said that the mind [*nous*] acts without

ὀργάνων τὸν νοῦν ἐνεργεῖν, τὴν αἰσθητικὴν καὶ μετ' ὀργάνου.]

sub lemmate ἐκ τῶν Πορφυρίου Περὶ τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεων = *Porph. F 251 (BT 268.14–269.6 Smith)* 1–12 *Aristo Chius F 377 SVF* = *F II 9 FSA* 1 τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις] *cf.* **15**.7–8 4 ἀντιληπτικὴν δύνάμιν τῆς ψυχῆς] *cf. Plu., De fortuna* 3 98B

[*FP*] 2 ἐπεξελθὼν τῇ *FP*: ἐπεξελθεῖν τῇ *Wachsmuth*: ἐπεξελθόντι *Meineke* 3 ἐπικριθείσῃ *FP*: ἐπικρίσει τῇ *Usener*: “*nihil mutandum est*” *Arnim* 5 μέν τι *F*: μέν τοι *P* 9 ἄλλων *FP*: ἄλόγων *Heeren* || ὠνόμασται *F*: ὀνόμασται *P*: *corr. Heeren* 12 ⟨ῆ⟩ *add. Heeren* || νοῦν φαίνεται *FP*: *corr. Heeren* 12–13 *secl. Wachsmuth ut summarium margini olim adscriptum*

IV. DICTA

vide dicta Aristonis in textibus antiquis reperta.

- 1 Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* 13.15 563 F (BT 3.242.24–243.3 Kaibel) = **13A**.11–14
- 2 Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem* 20.407 (4.428.20–429.1 Van der Valk) = **13B**.6–8
- 3 Plutarchus, *Amatorius* 21 766F (BT 4.383.9–10 Hubert) = **22**.13–14
- 4 Plutarchus, *De curiositate* 3 516F (BT 3.315.21–23 Paton *et al.*) = **26**.11–13

organs, the sense faculty also in conjunction with an organ.]⁴

¹ Stobaeus quotes this passage under the heading “On the faculties of the soul.”

² Editors often accept Wachsmuth’s correction in l. 2. In that case the text reads: “The task before us now is to give an outline of the faculties of the soul and first to address ourselves critically to the research . . . in our teachers. Aristo posits. . . .”

³ This passage is not included as a fragment of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli and Knögel. It is included as a fragment of Aristo of Chios by Arnim, but not by Ioppolo 1980 (18²³), who prefers to assign it to Aristo of Ceos (272–8; Mansfeld 1985, 214 disagrees). Grilli 1971 considers both Aristo of Ceos and Aristo of Alexandria, but opts for Aristo of Alexandria (not included in the edition of I. Mariotti). Sharples, *DNP* 1 (1996) 1116 s.v. Ariston [3], appears to consider Aristo of Ceos more likely than Aristo of Chios or Aristo of Alexandria. Smith in his edition of Porphyry takes it to refer to Aristo of Chios; Zeller 1921, 926³ and Edelstein 1955, 418 to Aristo of Ceos.

M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* 2.85 has pointed out the similarity between this fragment and Philodemus, *On Poems* 5, *PHerc.* 1425 col. 20.21–6 Jensen = 23.21–6 Mangoni, which is part of a passage (col. 13.28–21.22 Jensen = 16.28–24.22 Mangoni) in which Philodemus criticizes a Stoic, whose name Jensen has supplied in col. 13.30 = 16.30 Mangoni as [Aris]to and whom he identified as Aristo of Chios. See for this passage, Mangoni p. 61–9; Porter 1994, 81–5 and for the connection with 29 Ioppolo 1980, 277–8. The Stoic must remain anonymous for the time being.

⁴ The last sentence was deleted by Wachsmuth as an interpolated summary.

IV. SAYINGS

See sayings of Aristo found in ancient texts.

- 1 Athenaeus, *Sophists at Dinner* 13.15 563 F (BT 3.242.24–243.3 Kaibel) = **13A**.11–14
- 2 Eustathius, *Commentary on Homer’s Iliad* 20.407 (4.428.20–429.1 Van der Valk) = **13B**.6–8
- 3 Plutarch, *Dialogue on Love* 21 766F (BT 4.383.9–10 Hubert) = **22**.13–14
- 4 Plutarch, *On Being a Busybody* 3 516F (BT 3.315.21–23 Paton et al.) = **26**.11–13

- 5 Plutarchus, *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae* 10 804D (BT 5.1.75.4–7 Hubert) = **27**.14–17
- 6 Varro, *Logistoricus: Catus De liberis educandis* ap. Nonium 308 M.35–7 (BT 2.481.12–14 Lindsay) = **28**.3–5

vide etiam dicta quae Aristoni Ceo perperam attribuuntur.

- 7 *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 120 (55.4–6 Sternbach) = **41**
- 8 *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 121 (55.11 Sternbach) = **42**
- 9 *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 122 (55.13–16 Sternbach) = **43**
- 10 *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 123 (55.18–19 Sternbach) = **44**
- 11 Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 4.22a.16 (4.497.1–4 Hense) = **45**
- 12 Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 3.20.69 (3.554.20–2 Hense) = **46**
- 13 Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 4.52a.18 (5.1077.15–20 Hense) = **47**
- 14 Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 4.15b.31 (4.392.16–19 Hense) = **48**
- 15 Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 4.50b.83 (5.1049.5–8 Hense) = **49**

***30** vide quae Photius de dictis a Stobaeo collectis dicit, *Bibliotheca* 167 114a14–115b17, quo loco Aristo nominatur inter philosophos ex quibus Stobaeus excerpsit (114a20 [CB 2.155.11 Henry]).

- 5 Plutarchus, *Precepts of Statecraft* 10 804D (BT 5.1.75.4–7 Hubert) = **27.14–17**
- 6 Varro, *Logistoricus: Catus On the Education of Children*, in Nonius 308 M.35–7 (BT 2.481.12–14 Lindsay) = **28.3–5**

See also the sayings that are wrongly attributed to Aristo of Ceos.

- 7 *Vatican Gnomology*, no. 120 (55.4–6 Sternbach) = **41**
- 8 *Vatican Gnomology*, no. 121 (55.11 Sternbach) = **42**
- 9 *Vatican Gnomology*, no. 122 (55.13–16 Sternbach) = **43**
- 10 *Vatican Gnomology*, no. 123 (55.18–19 Sternbach) = **44**
- 11 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 4.22a.16 (4.497.1–4 Hense) = **45**
- 12 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 3.20.69 (3.554.20–2 Hense) = **46**
- 13 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 4.52a.18 (5.1077.15–20 Hense) = **47**
- 14 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 4.15b.31 (4.392.16–19 Hense) = **48**
- 15 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 4.50b.83 (5.1049.5–8 Hense) = **49**

***30** See what Photius says about the sayings collected by Stobaeus, *Library* 167 114a14–115b17, where Aristo is named among philosophers from whom Stobaeus excerpted (114a20 [CB 2.155.11 Henry]).

V. NON RECEPTA

Aristo Peripateticus ≠ Aristo Ceus

- 31** Strabo, *Geographica* 14.2.19 657–8 C. (BT 3.917.28–918.4 Meineke)

φασὶ δ' Ἴπποκράτην μάλιστα ἐκ τῶν ἐνταῦθα ἀνα-
 8 w κειμένων θεραπειῶν γυμνάσασθαι τὰ περὶ τὰς διαί-
 τας. οὗτός τε δὴ ἐστὶ τῶν ἐνδόξων Κῶος ἀνὴρ καὶ
 Σῖμος ὁ ἰατρός, Φιλίτας τε, ποιητὴς ἅμα καὶ κριτικός,
 καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς Νικίας ὁ καὶ τυραννήσας Κῶων, καὶ 5
 Ἀρίστων ὁ ἀκροασάμενος τοῦ Περιπατητικοῦ καὶ
 κληρονομήσας ἐκεῖνον· ἦν δὲ καὶ Θεόμνηστος ὁ ψάλ-
 τῆς ἐν ὀνόματι, ὃς καὶ ἀντεπολιτεύσατο τῷ Νικίᾳ.

1–3 *Plinius, N.H.* 29.4 3–4 *Philetas T 13 Kuchenmüller* = *T 4 Sbardella*
 = *T 2 Dettori* 3–5 *Philetas T 11 Spanoudakis* 4 Σῖμος] *RE B 3.1* (1927)
 903 [9] 5 Νικίας] *RE 17.1* (1936) 334 [14]; *DNP 8* (2000) 915 [8]
 6 Ἀρίστων] *cf. RE 2* (1896) 956 [53]; *DNP 1* (1996) 1117 [4]; *DPhA 1*
 (1989) 404 [399] || τοῦ Περιπατητικοῦ] *vid. ad 1.1–2*

[*BCDFP et hiqxyz*] 4 Φιλίτας *BCD hqz*: φιλιτάς *P*: φιλιτὰς *F*:
 Φιλήτας *ixy*, *Xylander*: Φιλητᾶς *Tzschucke* || κριτικός *DF*: κρητικός
BC 6 ἀρίστων ὁ *codd.*: Ἀρίστωνος *Bywater* 1882, 79

Aristo Chius

- *32** Plutarchus, *Demosthenes* 10.2–3 (BT 1.2.289.15–24 Ziegler)

2 Ἀρίστων δ' ὁ Χῖος καὶ Θεοφράστου τινὰ δόξαν
 ἰστόρηκε περὶ τῶν ῥητόρων· ἐρωτηθέντα γὰρ ὁποῖός

V. NOT ACCEPTED

Aristo the Peripatetic ≠ Aristo of Ceos

- 31** Strabo, *Geography* 14.2.19 657–8 C. (BT 3.917.28–918.4 Meineke)

They say that it was above all on the basis of the cures dedicated (on votive tablets) there that Hippocrates practised dietetics.¹ He is, of course, one of the famous men of Cos. Also (famous were) Simus the physician, and Philetas, both poet and critic, and in our own time Nicias, who in fact was tyrant of the Coans,² and also Aristo, the one who was a pupil of the Peripatetic and his heir.³ Also notable was Theomnestus, the harpist, who was also Nicias' political opponent.

¹ I.e., in the sanctuary of Asclepius on the island of Cos.

² I.e., between *ca.* 40 and 31 B.C.

³ This passage is included in the fragments of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli (but not by Knögel). Zeller 1921, 925², Susemihl *GGL* 1.152⁷⁹⁵, Gercke *RE*, 956, Wehrli on F 8 p. 50, Caujolle-Goulet *DPhA* 1 (1989) 404, and Sharples *DNP* 1 (1996) 1117 take the “Peripatetic” to be Aristo of Ceos. However, the phrase “in our own time” (see Potheary 1997)—if it extends past the καί at the end of line 5 and applies to Aristo—makes it impossible for this Aristo to have been a pupil and heir of Aristo of Ceos; cp. Gottschalk 1973, 96; and Hahm in this volume. The identity of the “Peripatetic” remains unclear.

On the Aristo (of Cos) mentioned here, see *DNP* 1 (1996) 1117 [4]; *DPhA* 1 (1989) 404 [399]; Wehrli on Aristo of Ceos F 8 p. 50 and *Ariston der Jüngere* p. 83–4; Gottschalk 1973, 96–7 and Hahm in this volume. See also **38** n.1. Bywater's conjecture would give “and in our own time Nicias, who both was tyrant of the Coans and a pupil of Aristo the Peripatetic and his heir.” This would remove the oddity of saying “the Peripatetic” without a proper name, and at the same time it would remove one Aristo, but the problem of (Aristo) “the Peripatetic” would remain.

Aristo of Chios

- *32** Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 10.2–3 (BT 1.2.289.15–24 Ziegler)

- 2 Aristo of Chios has also reported an opinion of Theophrastus concerning the (two) orators: when he was asked what kind of

τις αὐτῷ φαίνεται ῥήτωρ ὁ Δημοσθένης, εἰπεῖν· “ἄξιος
 τῆς πόλεως”· ὁποῖος δέ τις ὁ Δημάδης· “ὑπὲρ τὴν πό-
 3 λιν.” ὁ δ’ αὐτὸς φιλόσοφος Πολύευκτον ἱστορεῖ τὸν 5
 Σφήτιον, ἓνα τῶν τότε πολιτευομένων Ἀθήνησιν,
 ἀποφαίνεσθαι, μέγιστον μὲν εἶναι ῥήτορα Δημοσθέ-
 νην, δυνατώτατον δ’ εἰπεῖν Φωκίωνα· πλεῖστον γὰρ ἐν
 βραχυτάτῃ λέξει νοῦν ἐκφέρειν.

Aristo Ceus F 16 Knögel = Aristo Chius F 381 SVF = F V 3 FSA; cf. 14A–B et 8.12 1–9 Thphr. no. 706 FHS&G 1–5 Demad. de Falco p. 12 5–9 Plu., Phoc. 5.4–5 et Praec. ger. rep. 7 803E 5 Πολύευκτον] RE 21.2 (1952) 1614–16 [4]

[N(U=)N(ABCE=)Y] 1 ὁ Χίος] ὁ Κεῖος Mayer 1907–10, 488, de Falco, Knögel 4 τις ὁ om. Y 5 φιλόσοφος Y: Θεόφραστος N 5–7 ὁ δ’ αὐτὸς φιλόσοφος—ἀποφαίνεσθαι] καὶ πρὸς τοῦτ’ ὅμοιον ἀπιδὼν ὁ Σφήτιος Πολύευκτος εἰπεῖν, ὅτι Phoc.: ὁ γοῦν Πολύευκτος ἀπεφαίνετο Praec. 7 μέγιστον] ἄριστος Phoc. 8 δυνατώτατον] δεινότητος Phoc.: δεινότητον Praec.

***33** Plutarchus, *Demosthenes* 30.1 (BT 1.2.310.6–7 Ziegler)

τὸ δὲ φάρμακον Ἀρίστων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ καλάμου φη-
 σὶ λαβεῖν αὐτόν, ὥς εἴρηται.

Aristo Ceus F 17 Knögel = Aristo Chius F 380 SVF = F V 2 FSA; cf. 14A–B

[vid. ad 32] 1–2 λαβεῖν φησιν Y 2 ὥς εἴρηται] vid. 29.4–7

***34** Plutarchus, *Cato Maior* 18.4 (BT 1.1.311.19–25 Ziegler)

Aristo Chius F 398 SVF = F V 4 FSA; cf. 14A–B

orator Demosthenes appeared to him (to be), he said, “(one) such as befits the city”; and (when asked) what kind Demades (appeared to him), “(one) superior to the city.” The same philosopher¹ reports that Polyeuctus of Sphettus, one of those politically active in Athens at the time, declared Demosthenes to be the greatest orator, but Phocion the most capable in speaking, for he conveyed the greatest amount of thought in the fewest words.²

¹ I.e., Aristo. In two other versions of this judgment by Polyeuctus (*Life of Phocion* 5.4–5 and *Precepts of Statecraft* 7 803E), Plutarch quotes Polyeuctus directly.

² This passage is included in the fragments of Aristo of Ceos by Knögel (but not by Wehrli) and in those of Aristo of Chios by Arnim. The source is explicitly specified as “Aristo of Chios.” Knögel and De Falco (*Demade oratore* p. 12) follow Mayer 1907–10, 488 in changing the reading of the MSS “Aristo of Chios” into “Aristo of Ceos.” On this fragment, see Knögel on F 16–17 p. 86–7 and Ioppolo 1980, 53; 190⁷. Cp. also the title *Against the Orators* in the list of writings of Aristo of Chios (8.12).

***33** Plutarch, *Demosthenes* 30.1 (BT 1.2.310.6–7 Ziegler)

As for the poison, Aristo says that he (Demosthenes) took it from the reed, as has been said.¹

¹ This is the closure of the description Plutarch has just given (29.4–7) of how Demosthenes committed suicide by biting, as if in deep thought, on the reed he used for writing, in which poison had been concealed. Plutarch then goes on to give another version of how Demosthenes took the poison.

This passage is included in the fragments of Aristo of Ceos by Knögel (but not by Wehrli) and in those of Aristo of Chios by Arnim. The source is referred to as “Aristo,” who is likely to be the same as “Aristo of Chios” mentioned earlier in the same text (32). See further 32 n. 2.

***34** Plutarch, *Cato Maior* 18.4 (BT 1.1.311.19–25 Ziegler)¹

¹ This passage is not included in the fragments of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli or Knögel; it is included in those of Aristo of Chios by Arnim. Mayer 1907–10, 489 takes it to refer to Aristo of Ceos, but see Knögel 1933, 86² and Ioppolo 1980, 103³⁰.

- *35** Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* 15.62.7–13 (GCS 8.2.423.26–424.21 Mras)

Aristo Chius F 353 SVF = F II 1 FSA

Aristo Iunior

- *36** Sextus Empiricus, *Adversus mathematicos* 2.61 (BT 3.96.27–9 Mau)

Ariston der Jüngere F 2 Wehrli; vid. RE 2 (1896) 956 [53]; DNP 1 (1996) 1117 [5]; DPhA 1 (1989) 396 [392]; cf. 37

- *37** Quintilianus, *Institutio Oratoria* 2.15.19–20 (OCT 1.108.5–16 Winterbottom)

Ariston der Jüngere F 1 Wehrli || vid. ad 36

- *38** Philodemus, *De rhetorica*, *PHerc.* 1004, fr. 12.4–15 (BT 1.328–9 Sudhaus)

Ariston der Jüngere F 3 Wehrli; vid. ad 36; cf. 39–40 || “uidetur autem maxima pars huius libri contra Aristonem Stoicum conscripta esse, cuius mentio fit fragmento XII [38] et contra quem usque ad pag. LXXI [39] uerba facit.” Sudhaus p. LII; “discipulus Critolai” in indice vol. 2 p. 313

- *39** Philodemus, *De rhetorica*, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 71.4–16 (BT 1.360 Sudhaus)

Ariston der Jüngere F 4 Wehrli ; vid. ad 36 et 38; cf. 38, 40

- *35** Eusebius, *Preparation for the Gospel* 15.62.7–13 (GCS 8.2.423.26–424.21 Mras)¹

¹ This passage is not included in the fragments of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli or Knögel; it is included in those of Aristo of Chios by Arnim. In the text, the source is explicitly specified as “Aristo of Chios (and his associates).” On this passage, see Ioppolo 1980, 78–90, who takes it to refer to Aristo of Chios (Mansfeld 1985, 211–2 argues for “a Sceptic”). It is taken to refer to Aristo of Ceos by Mras 1955, who unlike Mayer (see **32** n. 2) does not change the MSS reading Χῖον into Κεῖον, but explains the mistake by a confusion of the two Aristos dating from antiquity (93); he is followed by Alfonsi 1957.

Aristo the Younger

- *36** Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Professors* 2.61 (BT 3.96.27–9 Mau)¹

¹ In this and the following passage (**37**) an Aristo is named as a “familiar” and a “pupil” respectively of Critolaus. Zeller 1921, 926³ takes both passages to refer to Aristo of Ceos (cp. 930²); he is followed by Edelstein 1955, 418. On Aristo the Younger, as distinct from Aristo of Ceos, see Wehrli, *Ariston der Jüngere*, 83–4; Mariotti, *Aristone d’Alessandria*, 75–8.

- *37** Quintilian, *Education of the Orator* 2.15.19–20 (OCT 1.108.5–16 Winterbottom)¹

¹ See **36** n. 1.

- *38** Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*, *PHerc.* 1004, fr. 12.4–15 (BT 1.328–9 Sudhaus)¹

¹ In *On Rhetoric* Philodemus names an unspecified Aristo three times (**38–40**). On the identity of this Aristo and the role he plays in *On Rhetoric*, see Arnim 1900 (who p. 13 proposes to identify this Aristo with the Aristo of Cos mentioned in Strabo 14.2.19 [**31**], as Gercke *RE* 956 s.v. Ariston [53] had done) and Wehrli, *Ariston der Jüngere*, 83–4. **38–40** are included by Wehrli as F 3–5 of the younger Aristo. Mayer 1907–10, however, identifies this Aristo with Aristo of Ceos (p. 522–5; on **38** in particular, see p. 597).

- *39** Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*, *PHerc.* 1004, col. 71.4–16 (BT 1.360 Sudhaus)¹

¹ See **38** n. 1. On **39** in particular, see Mayer 1907–10, 526 & 598.

- *40** Philodemus, *De rhetorica*, *PHerc.* 1506, fr. 4.5–12 (BT 2. 197–8 Sudhaus) = *PHerc.* 240 fr. 16.6–12 (BT 2.277 Sudhaus)

Ariston der Jüngere F 5 Wehrli = *Critolaus* F 30 Wehrli; cf. *Thphr. no.* 27 *FHS&G*; vid. ad **36** et **38**; cf. **38–9**

Dicta

vide etiam IV DICTA et Homoiômata **45–7**.

- *41** *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 120 (55.4–6 Sternbach)

Ἀρίστων ὁ φιλόσοφος τοὺς πλουσίους καὶ φειδωλοὺς ὁμοίους ἔφησεν εἶναι τοῖς ἡμίονοις, οὔτινες χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον φέροντες χόρτον ἐσθίουσιν.

cf. **42–4** 1–3 *Aristo Ceus Knögel* p. 93 “*unsichere Fragmente*” = *Aristo Chius Ioppolo* p. 331 “*Testimonianze mancanti negli SVF*” = *App. Vat. I* 22 (173.14–15 Sternbach) = *Gnom. Neap.* 6 (170.2–3 Sbordone) “*Haec sententia simul cum sequentibus [42; 43; 44] procul dubio ex Aristonis Chii opere deperdito, quod inscriptum erat ‘Ὅμοιώματα, est deprompta’ Sternbach* 1 Ἀρίστων ὁ φιλόσοφος] vid. ad **11.3**

2 ἔφη *App. Vat.*, *Gnom. Neap.* 2–3 οὔτινες—ἐσθίουσιν] οὔτινες τίμια βασιτάζοντες ἄτιμα ἐσθίουσιν *App. Vat.*, *Gnom. Neap.*

- *42** *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 121 (55.11 Sternbach)

ὁ αὐτὸς πολυκέφαλον θηρίον εἶπεν πάντα δῆμον.

cf. **41, 43–4** *Aristo Ceus Knögel* p. 93 “*unsichere Fragmente*” = *Aristo Chius Ioppolo* p. 331 “*Testimonianze mancanti negli SVF*”; vid. ad **41.1–3** || πολυκέφαλον θηρίον ... δῆμον] cf. *Pl., Resp.* 9 588C et 589A–B; *Procl., In Alc.* 2.223.28–30 *Segonds*

- *43** *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 122 (55.13–16 Sternbach)

ὁ αὐτὸς τοὺς τὰ γραπτὰ λέγοντας ὁμοίους ἔφησεν εἶναι τοῖς λεοντοχάσμασι [τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν κεράμων].

- *40** Philodemus, *On Rhetoric*, *PHerc.* 1506, fr. 4.5–12 (BT 2.197–8 Sudhaus) = *PHerc.* 240 fr. 16.6–12 (BT 2.277 Sudhaus)¹

¹ See **38** n. 1.

Sayings

See also IV SAYINGS and *Comparisons* **45–7**.

- *41** *Vatican Gnomology*, no. 120 (55.4–6 Sternbach)

Aristo the philosopher said that the rich and parsimonious are similar to the mules that carry gold and silver but eat grass.¹

¹ This and the following three (**42–4**) passages are included in the fragments of Aristo of Ceos under the heading “uncertain” by Knögel (but not by Wehrli); they are included in those of Aristo of Chios by Ioppolo (but not by Arnim). In the *Vatican Gnomology* the saying in question is attributed to “Aristo the philosopher;” the following three sayings are linked to it by means of the phrase “The same man.” The editor attributes them to Aristo of Chios. On these four sayings, see Gottschalk 1973, 99–100 (“Sternbach’s view that these sayings belong to the Stoic, Ariston of Chios . . . , is almost certainly right.”); Knögel 1933, 93, who leaves the matter open; and Searby in this volume. Cp. the *Comparisons* (**45–7**), which are attributed to Aristo of Chios.

- *42** *Vatican Gnomology*, no. 121 (55.11 Sternbach)

The same man (Aristo the philosopher) said that every popular voting assembly¹ is a many-headed beast.²

¹ There is no equivalent in English to catch all the connotations of the Greek word *dēmos*, which denotes the people who assembled in bodies like the *ekklesia* and in Athens had sovereign power.

² Cp. **41** n. 1.

- *43** *Vatican Gnomology*, no. 122 (55.13–16 Sternbach)

The same man (Aristo the philosopher) said that those who speak (from) written texts are like the spouts in the shape of a gaping lion’s mouth [on tiled roofs]. For the latter, as long as it is rain-

ἐκεῖνα μὲν γάρ, ἕως [μὲν] ἂν βρέχη, ῥεῖ· [ὅταν δὲ παύ-
σῃται, κέχηνεν· οὗτοί τε, ἕως ἂν ἔχωσι γραπτὰ λέγειν,
εὐρόως φέρονται· ὅταν δὲ ἐπιλείπη, χάσκουσιν.] 5

cf. **41–2, 44** 1–5 *Aristo Ceus Knögel* p. 93 “*unsichere Fragmente*” = *Aristo Chius Ioppolo* p. 331 “*Testimonianze mancanti negli SVF*” = *App. Vat.* I 23 (173.16–17 *Sternbach*) = *Gnom. Neap.* 7 (170.4–6 *Sbordone*); vid. ad **41.1–3** || in *App. Vat.* I sequitur sub lemmate ὁ αὐτὸς *apophthegma* (no. 24), quod in *Gnom. Vat.* no. 126 *Aesopo* attribuitur; in *Gnom. Neap.* sequitur *apophthegma* (no. 8) *anonymum* (a *Sbordone Aristoni* attributum), quod ex *Chrys. ecl.* 1–48 PG 63.649.14–17 *depromptum est*

2 λεοντοχάσμοις *App. Vat.*, *Gnom. Neap.* 2–6 *verba uncis inclusa omittunt App. Vat.*, *Gnom. Neap.*

***44** *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, no. 123 (55.18–19 *Sternbach*)

ὁ αὐτὸς παρεκελεύετο τοὺς τῶν ὑγιαίνοντων πόνοους
ἀναδέχεσθαι, ἵνα μὴ τοὺς τῶν νοσοῦντων ὑπομένωμεν.

cf. **41–3** 1–2 *Aristo Ceus Knögel* p. 93 “*unsichere Fragmente*” = *Aristo Chius Ioppolo* p. 331 “*Testimonianze mancanti negli SVF*”; vid. ad **41.1–3**

Homoiōmata [Ὅμοιώματα **45–7**]

vide etiam IV DICTA et Dicta **41–4**.

45 *Stobaeus, Anthologium* 4.22a.16 (4.497.1–4 *Hense*)

26 W

ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος·
Σπαρτιατῶν νόμος τάττει ζημίας, τὴν μὲν πρώτην
ἀγαμίου, τὴν δευτέραν ὀψιγαμίου, τὴν τρίτην καὶ μεγ-
ίστην κακογαμίου.

cf. **46–7** 1–4 *Aristo Ceus Knögel* p. 92 “*unsichere Fragmente*” = *Aristo Chius F 400 SVF* = *F V 5 FSA*; cf. *Plu.*, *Lys.* 30.5; *Poll.* 3.48; 8.40; *Clem. Al.*, *Strom.* 2.23.141.5 1 ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος] cf. ad **46.1** et **47.1**; cf. Ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὅμοιωμάτων. Ἀρίστων ὁ Χῖος *Stob.*, *Anth.* 3.4.109

ing, flow (with water), [but when (the rain) stops, gape empty, while the former, as long as they have a written text to speak (from), run on with an easy flow (of words), but when this runs out, stand gaping (with nothing to say)].¹

¹ Cp **41** n. 1. On sayings no. 24 of the *Appendix Vaticana* I and no. 8 in the *Gnomologium Neapolitanum* (see the *apparatus*), see Searby in this volume.

***44** *Vatican Gnomology*, no. 123 (55.18–19 Sternbach)

The same man (Aristo the philosopher) exhorted (us) to undertake the labors of the healthy so that we will not have to endure those of the sick.¹

¹ Cp. **41** n. 1.

Comparisons [*Comparisons* **45–7**]

See also IV SAYINGS and Sayings **41–4**.

45 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 4.22a.16 (4.497.1–4 Hense)

From the (*Comparisons*?) of Aristo:¹

The law of the Spartans imposes (three) fines, the first for not marrying, the second for marrying late, the third and largest for marrying badly.²

¹ The heading in its fullest form, as in **47**, is “From the *Comparisons* of Aristo”; of this type, there are eleven instances (see on **47**). **45** is the only instance where the title belonging with the article is omitted. A third type, as in **46**, is even shorter and has only the name “(of) Aristo”; of this type, there are four instances (see on **46**). These three types are usually taken together as all pertaining to the *Comparisons* of Aristo. In one case, the Aristo of the heading is further

[*eclogam cum lemmate habent SMA*] 2 νόμος SM^2 : νόμωσ M^1 :
νόμους A 3 ἀγάμου M

***46** Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 3.20.69 (3.554.20–2 Hense)

Ἀρίστωνος·

τὴν κακολογίαν ἡ ὀργὴ φαίνεται ἀπογεννώσα
†ὥστε ἡ μήτηρ οὐκ ἀστεῖα†.

cf. **45, 47** 1–3 *Aristo Ceus Knögel* p. 92 “*unsichere Fragmente*” =
Aristo Chius F 395 SVF = *F IV 14 FSA* 1 Ἀρίστωνος] cf. Ἀρίστωνος
2.1.24 (352 SVF); 2.2.18 (393 SVF = *IV 12 FSA*); 2.2.22 (391 SVF = *IV*
10 FSA); vid. ad **45.1**

[*eclogam cum lemmate habent SMA*] 3 ὥστε ἡ SM^dA : ὥσπερ εἰ
Meineke: ὥς τέκνα *Bücheler*, “*quod verum videtur*” *Hense*: ὥς τέ(κνα
καλ)ῇ *Gomperz* 1912, 301–3 || ἀστεῖα (ἀστεῖα A^2) *SMA*

***47** Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 4.52a.18 (5.1077.15–20 Hense)

ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὀμοιωμάτων·

πολλοὶ σοφοὶ γηραιοὶ φιλοζωοῦσι. καὶ γὰρ οἱ ὅψε
γήμεντες φιλοζωοῦσιν, ἵν' ἐκθρέψωσι τὰ τέκνα, καὶ
οὗτοι ὅψε ἀρετῆς ἐπήβολοι γενόμενοι ἐφίενται αὐτὴν
ἐκθρέψαι.

5

cf. **45–6** 1–5 *Aristo Ceus Knögel* p. 92 “*unsichere Fragmente*” =
Aristo Chius F 399 SVF = *F IV 17 FSA* 1 ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὀμοι-
ωμάτων] cf. ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὀμοιωμάτων 2.2.14 (392 SVF = *IV 11*

specified as “Aristo of Chios” (3.4.109). In two cases, a *homoiōma* quoted by Stobaeus is similar to a saying quoted by Diogenes Laertius in his *Life* of Aristo of Chios: Stob., *Anth.* 2.1.24 ≈ D.L. 7.160 and 2.2.22 ≈ 7.161.

² This passage is included in the fragments of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli (and by Knögel under the heading “uncertain”); and in those of Aristo of Chios by Arnim. Ritschl 1842, 198–200 and Zeller 1921, 926–7³ attribute the *Comparisons* to Aristo of Chios. They are followed by Heinze 1890, 512¹; Hense 1890, 543¹; Giesecke 1892, 208–9; Weber 1896 and Ioppolo 1980, who discusses the *Comparisons* p. 308–12 (cp. Mansfeld 1985, 210). Gercke 1892, 203–5 & 210–1 attributes them “wholly or partly” to Aristo of Ceos; he is followed by Mras 1955, 91–2. Knögel 1933, 92 thinks that the *Comparisons* largely “aus der Gedankenwelt des Stoikers stammen,” but that three of them (45–7) may derive from Aristo of Ceos. See also Hahm and Searby in this volume.

***46** Stobaeus, *Anthology* 3.20.69 (3.554.20–2 Hense)

(of) Aristo:¹

Anger is seen to breed evil-speaking, †as a result the mother not well-behaved (children?)†.²

¹ See 45 n. 1.

² The text is clearly corrupt. With the accent it carries in the text that we have printed, the Greek word for “well-behaved” [ἀστεῖα] is neuter plural and must refer to “children” ([τέκνα]); with the accent as corrected in one of the MSS, to the mother. The former is adopted by Bücheler, whose conjecture would give “as a mother [or “nice mother” with Gomperz] (breeds) children not well-behaved”; the latter by Arnim, who keeps the text as it is with a semi-colon after ἀπογεννώσα: “and so the mother (is) not well-bred.”

This passage is included in the fragments of Aristo of Ceos by Knögel under the heading “uncertain” (but not by Wehrli); and in those of Aristo of Chios by Arnim. See 45 n. 2.

***47** Stobaeus, *Anthology* 4.52a.18 (5.1077.15–20 Hense)

From the *Comparisons* of Aristo:¹

Many men of wisdom grown old cling to life. For those who have married late too cling to life, so as to see their children fully grown up, and so these, having attained to virtue late in life, desire to see it fully grown.²

¹ See 45 n. 1.

² This passage is included in the fragments of Aristo of Ceos by Knögel under the heading “uncertain” (but not by Wehrli); it is included in those of Aristo of

FSA); 2.2.23 (394 SVF = IV 13 FSA); 2.31.83 (387 SVF = IV 6 FSA); 2.31.95 (396 SVF = IV 15 FSA); 3.4.109 (350 SVF = IV 1 FSA); 3.13.40 (383 SVF = IV 2 FSA); 3.13.57 (384 SVF = IV 3 FSA); 4.25.44 (386 SVF = IV 5 FSA); 4.31d.110 (397 SVF = IV 16 FSA); ὁ αὐτὸς 3.4.110 (350 SVF = IV 1 FSA); vid. ad 45.1

[eclogam cum lemmate habent SA] 1 ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὁμοιωμάτων] ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστου S

Chreiai [Ἀριστοτέλους Χρεῖαι 48–9]

*48 Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 4.15b.31(4.392.16–19 Hense)

ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν·

Ζήνων ὁ Στωϊκὸς φιλόσοφος ὁρῶν τινα τῶν γνωρίμων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγροῦ περισπώμενον εἶπεν “ἐὰν μὴ σὺ τοῦτον ἀπολέσης, οὗτός σε ἀπολέσει.”

cf. 49 1–4 Arist. *Fragm.* 782 Gigon = 9 Rose Pseud. = Arist. *Apopht.* 7 Searby = Aristo Ceus Knögel p. 93 “unsichere Fragmente” = Zeno F 312 SVF || cf. Aristotelis Chreias ap. Stob., *Anth.* 3.5.42 (= 777 Gigon, 4 Rose, 1 Searby); 3.7.29 (= 778 G. 8 R. 2 S.); 3.7.30 (= 778 G. 3 R. 3 S.); 3.29.70 (= 779 G. 1 R. 4 S.); 3.29.90 (= 780 G. 6 R. 5 S.); 4.1.144 (= 781 G. 7 R. 6 S.); 4.31c.91 (= 783 G. 2 R. 8 S.); 4.51.28 (= 785 G. 5 R. 10 S.) || “si quid video chriae istae litterarum ordine dispositae erant ita ut a claro Aristotelis nomine exordium sumeretur. sic facile fieri poterat ut tota collectio Aristotelis esse videretur homini posterioris aevi male instructo” Hense ad eclogam 3.5.42 (3.269) 2–4 *Gnom. Par.* 259 p. 160 Sternbach

[eclogam cum lemmate habent SMA] 2 φιλόσοφος om. *Gnom. Par.* 2–3 τῶν γνωρίμων] γνώριμον *Gnom. Par.* 3 ἀγροῦ] ἀγρίου Arnim coll. schol. (RVE) Ar. *Nub.* 349a ἀγρίους ἐκάλουν τοὺς πεδεραστάς || σὺ om. *Gnom. Par.*

*49 Stobaeus, *Anthologium* 4.50b.83 (5.1049.5–8 Hense)

ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν·

Ἄλεξις ὁ τῶν κωμωδιῶν ποιητής, ἐπειδὴ τις αὐτὸν ὄντα πρεσβύτην ἐώρα μόλις πορευόμενον καὶ ἡρώτα “τί

Chios by Arnim. See 45 n. 2. On 47 in particular, see Ioppolo 1980, 117⁵⁹ and 308⁵¹ and Alfonsi 1957.

Anecdotal Sayings [*Anecdotal Sayings* of Aristotle 48–9]

*48 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 4.15b.31(4.392.16–19 Hense)

From the *Anecdotal Sayings* of Aristotle:¹

Zeno the Stoic philosopher, when he saw one of his acquaintances completely absorbed in (working) his land, said “If you do not finish this off, it will finish you off.”²

¹ There are ten quotations in Stobaeus under the heading “From the *Anecdotal Sayings* of Aristotle.” These have been collected by Rose, *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* 611–15; Gigon as F 777–85; and Searby *Apophth.* nos. 1–10. Rose assumed that these *Chreiai* were attributed to Aristotle by a scribe by mistake (“scriptura compendiosa male lecta”; for a different explanation suggested by Hense see the *apparatus*) and that they in fact are the *Chreiai* named in the list of books in the *Life* of Aristo of Chios by Diogenes Laertius (8.11). One of his reasons was that the two *chreiai* quoted here (48–9) cannot be attributed to Aristotle for chronological reasons (Zeno and Alexis being chronologically later than Aristotle). Knögel follows Rose and includes 48–9 in the fragments of Aristo of Ceos under the heading “uncertain,” without, however, deciding for Aristo of Ceos or for Aristo of Chios. For a full discussion of the *Chreiai* of Aristotle, see Searby, *Apophth.* 77–84; 145–57; 282–4.

² On this saying (and further parallels), see Searby on *Arist. Apophth.* no. 7 p. 98 & 153–4.

*49 Stobaeus, *Anthology* 4.50b.83 (5.1049.5–8 Hense)

From the *Anecdotal Sayings* of Aristotle:¹

When someone saw Alexis, the comic poet, as an old man making his way with difficulty and asked, “What are you doing?,”

ποιεῖς,” ἔφη “κατὰ σχολὴν ἀποθνήσκω.”

cf. **48** 1–4 *Arist. Fragm.* 784 *Gigon* = 10 *Rose Pseud.* = *Arist. Apophth.* 9 *Searby* = *Aristo Ceus Knögel* p. 93 “unsichere Fragmente” = *Alexis T 15 PCG II* = *Gnom. Vat.* 46 *Sternbach* = *Apophth. Vind.* 36 *Wachsmuth* = *Ars.* 101.9–12 *Walz* || *vid. ad 48.1–4*

[*eclogam sine lemmate habet S, addito lemmate MA; Tr = editio Trincavelliana Venetiis 1536*] 2 τῶν κωμωδιῶν] τῆς κωμωδίας *Apophth. Vind.* 3 ἑώρακε *Tr* 3–4 τί ποιεῖς *S, Gnom. Vat., Apophth. Vind.*: τὸ τί ποιεῖς (ποιεῖ *A*) *MA* 4 ἔφη] φησὶν *post σχολὴν Gnom. Vat.*

(Alexis) replied, “I am dying at leisure.”²

¹ See **48** n. 1.

² On this saying (and further parallels) see, Searby on *Arist. Apophth.* p. 99 & 155.

LIST OF CITATIONS OF ARISTO

I. Life

- 1.1–2** Ἀρίστων Ἰουλιήτης Περιπατητικός
2A.7 τῶν ἐκ τοῦ Περιπάτου φιλοσόφων Ἀρίστων
2B.4 Ἀρίστων ὁ Περιπατητικός
3.8 Ἀρίστων ἐκ Κέω
4A.3 Ἀρίστων
5.4 Ἀρίστωνι
5.15–16 Ἀρίστων Κεῖος
6.4 Ἀρίστων ὁ ἐκ Λυκείου

II. Writings

- 8.18–19** τοῦ Περιπατητικοῦ Ἀρίστωνος
9.8 Aristo
10.1–2 Ἀρίστων ὁ Περιπατητικός, Κεῖος δὲ τὸ γένος
11.3 Ἀρίστων ὁ φιλόσοφος
12.1 Ἀρίστων ὁ Κεῖος
13A.7–8 Ἀρίστων ὁ Κεῖος ὁ Περιπατητικός
13B.5 Ἀρίστων ὁ Κεῖος
14A.10 Ἀρίστων ὁ Κεῖος
14B.10 Ἀρίστων ὁ φιλόσοφος
15.7 Ἀρίστωνος
16.4 Ἀρίστων ὁ Κεῖος
17A.14 Ἀρίστων ὁ Περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος
17C.1 Ἀρίστων ὁ Περιπατητικός

III. Disputed

- 18.3** Aristo Chius
19.5 Ἀρίστ[ω]ν
20.38 Ἀρίστωνος
21a.10 Ἀρίστων
21g.34 ὁ Ἀρίστων
22.14 Ἀρίστων
23.6 Ἀρίστωνα

- 24A.3 Ἄριστων
 25.15 Ἄριστων
 26.12 Ἄριστων
 27.14 ὁ Ἄριστων
 28.4 Ariston
 29.4 Ἄριστων

IV. Sayings

- 30 Ἄριστωνος

V. Not Accepted

- 31.6 τοῦ Περιπατητικοῦ
 32.1 Ἄριστων ὁ Χῖος
 33.1 Ἄριστων
 34 τὸν φιλόσοφον Ἄριστωνα
 35 οἱ περὶ Ἄριστωνα τὸν Χῖον
 36 Ἄριστων ὁ Κριτολάου γνώριμος
 37 Ariston, Critolai Peripatetici discipulus
 38 τισιν Ἀριστωνεῖ[οις ὑπο]μνήμασιν
 39 Ἄριστωνος
 40 Ἀρί[στωνι], [Ἄριστωνι]
 41 Ἄριστων ὁ φιλόσοφος
 42 ὁ αὐτός
 43 ὁ αὐτός
 44 ὁ αὐτός
 45 ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος
 46 Ἀρίστωνος
 47 ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὀμοιωμάτων

CONCORDANCES

The following tables relate the texts collected in this edition (SFOD) to the editions of Aristo of Ceos by Wehrli (1968) and Knögel (1933); to the editions of Aristo of Chios by Arnim (*SVF*, 1905), Festa (*FSA*, 1935), and Ioppolo (1980); to the edition of Aristo Junior by Wehrli (1969); and to the edition of Aristo Alexandrinus by Mariotti (1966).

- 1 F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentare*, Heft 6: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos*, zweite, ergänzte und verbesserte Auflage, Basel & Stuttgart 1968, 27–67

Wehrli	SFOD	Wehrli	SFOD
1	1	14VII	21m
2a	2A	14VIII	21n
2b	2B	14IX	21o
3	3	15	20
4	6	16	26
5	5	17	13A
6	5	18	13A
7	4A	19	14B
8	31	20	14A
9	8	21	22
10	9	22	10
11	2A	23	12
12	18	24	11
13I	21a	25	27
13II	21b	26	45
13III	21c	27	28
13IV	21d	28	23
13V	21e	29	24A
13VI	21f	30	24B
13VII	21g	31	16
14I	21g	32	25
14II	21h	33	15
14III	21i	34a	17A
14IV	21j	34b	17B
14V	21k	34c	17C
14VI	21l	35	17D

SFOD	Wehrli	SFOD	Wehrli
1	1	21b	13II
2A	2a; 11	21c	13III
2B	2b	21d	13IV
3	3	21e	13V
4A	7	21f	13VI
5	5; 6	21g	13VII; 14I
6	4	21h	14II
8	9	21i	14III
9	10	21j	14IV
10	22	21k	14V
11	24	21l	14VI
12	23	21m	14VII
13A	17; 18	21n	14VIII
14A	20	21o	14IX
14B	19	22	21
15	33	23	28
16	31	24A	29
17A	34a	24B	30
17B	34b	25	32
17C	34c	26	16
17D	35	27	25
18	12	28	27
20	15	31	8
21a	13I	45	26

- 2 W. Knögel, *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem*, Leipzig 1933, Anhang: *Die Fragmente des Peripatetikers Ariston von Keos*, 79–94

Knögel	SFOD	Knögel	SFOD
T 1	1; 8	F 8	13A
T 2	2A; 2B	F 9	10
T 3	5	F 10	11
T 4	6	F 11	12
T 5	15	F 12	13A
T 6	18	F 13	14A
T 7	9	F 14	14B
T 7a	3	F 15	27
T 7b	4A		

Knögel	SFOD	Knögel	SFOD
F 16	*32	F 23	16
F 17	*33	F 24	20
F 18	17A; 17B;	F 25	26
	17C; 17D	p. 8–9	21a
F 19	23	p.11	21b
F 20	24A	p. 92	45; *46; *47
F 21	24B	p. 93	*41; *42; *43;
F 22	25		*44; *48; *49

SFOD	Knögel	SFOD	Knögel
1	T 1	18	F 6
2A	T 2	20	F 24
2B	T 2	21a	p. 8–9
3	T 7a	21b	p.11
4A	T 7b	23	F 19
5	T 3	24A	F 20
6	T 4	24B	F 21
8	T 1	25	F 22
9	T 7	26	F 25
10	F 9	27	F 15
11	F 10	*32	F 16
12	F 11	*33	F 17
13A	F 8; 12	*41	p. 93
14A	F 13	*42	p. 93
14B	F 14	*43	p. 93
15	T 5	*44	p. 93
16	F 23	45	p. 92
17A	F 18	*46	p. 92
17B	F 18	*47	p. 92
17C	F 18	*48	p. 93
17D	F 18	*49	p. 93

- 3 *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* collegit Ioannes ab Arnim, Volumen 1, Leipzig 1905, *Aristo Chius* 73–90

SVF	SFOD	SFOD	SVF
333	8	6	334
334	6	8	333

SVF	SFOD	SFOD	SVF
353	*35	22	390
377	*29	26	401
380	*33	27	402
381	*32	*29	377
390	22	*32	381
395	*46	*33	380
398	*34	*34	398
399	*47	*35	353
400	45	45	400
401	26	*46	395
402	27	*47	399

- 4 *I Frammenti degli Stoici Antichi* ordinati, tradotti e annotati da Nicola Festa, Vol. II, Bari 1935, 1–34

FSA	SFOD	SFOD	FSA
I 2	8	6	I 5
I 5	6	8	I 2
II 1	*35	22	IV 9
II 9	*29	26	V 6
V 2	*33	27	IV 18
V 3	*32	*29	II 9
IV 9	22	*32	V 3
IV 14	*46	*33	V 2
V 4	*34	*34	V 4
IV 17	*47	*35	II 1
V 5	45	45	V 5
V 6	26	*46	IV 14
IV 18	27	*47	IV 17

- 5 A.M. Ioppolo, *Aristone di Chio e lo Stoicismo Antico*, Naples 1980, “Testimonianze mancanti negli SVF” p. 331–2

Ioppolo	SFOD	SFOD	Ioppolo
p. 331	18; 23; 24A	18	p. 331
	24B; 25	23	p. 331
	*41; *42	24A	p. 331
	*43; *44	24B	p. 331

Ioppolo	SFOD	SFOD	Ioppolo
		25	p. 331
		*41	p. 331
		*42	p. 331
		*43	p. 331
		*44	p. 331

- 6 F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*, Heft 10: *Hieronimus von Rhodos. Kritolaos und seine Schüler. Rückblick: der Peripatos in vorchristlicher Zeit. Register*, zweite, ergänzte und verbesserte Auflage, Basel & Stuttgart 1969, *Ariston der Jüngere*, 77–84

Wehrli	SFOD	SFOD	Wehrli
1	*37	*36	2
2	*36	*37	1
3	*38	*38	3
4	*39	*39	4
5	*40	*40	5

- 7 I. Mariotti, *Aristone d’Alessandria*. Edizione e interpretazione, Bologna 1966

Mariotti	SFOD	SFOD	Mariotti
T 4	1	1	T 4

INDEX OF ARISTONEAN TEXTS EITHER PRINTED OR ENTERED IN THE APPARATUS OR IN A SEPARATE LIST

The numbers in bold refer to the fragments; *Dicta* to ‘IV. Sayings’.

APOPHTHEGMATA VINDOBONENSIA 36 (Wachsmuth) app. 49	2.2.104.38–105.4 app. 13A 2.2.150.23–30 app. 10
APPENDIX VATICANA 1.22 (173.14–15 Sternbach) app. 41 1.23 (173.16–17) app. 43	CICERO, MARCUS TULLIUS (106–43 aCn) <i>Cato Maior de Senectute</i> 1.3 (56.5–16 Powell) 7 no. 3; 18 <i>De finibus</i> 5.5.13 (BT 13.161.27–162.5 Schiche) 9
ARISTOTELES (384–322 aCn) <i>Apophthegmata</i> 7 Searby app. 48 9 app. 49	CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (s. 2–3 pCn) <i>Stromata</i> 1.14.63.5 (GCS 2.40.9–12 Stählin-Früchtel) *4B
<i>Fragmenta</i> 782 Gigon = 9 Rose <i>Pseud.</i> app. 48 784 Gigon = 10 Rose <i>Pseud.</i> app. 49	
ARSENIUS (saec. 15–16 pCn) <i>Violetum</i> 101.9–12 Walz app. 49	DIOGENES LAERTIUS (saec. 3 pCn) <i>Vitae Philosophorum</i> 2.22 (BT 1.107.3–6 Marcovich) 24B 5.61 (BT 1.352.14–15) 16 5.64 (BT 1.354.12–13) 16 5.69 (BT 1.357.8) 5 5.70 (BT 1.357.19–358.4) 5 5.74 (BT 1.360.6–11) 5 7.163 (BT 1.541.10–542.2) 8 7.164 (BT 1.542.10–13) 1 9.5 (BT 1.635.4–11) 7 no. 6; 23 9.11–12 (BT 1.639.1–7) 24A 10.13–14 (BT 1.718.10–719.15) 25 10.14 7 no. 7
ATHENAEUS NAUCRATITES (s. 2–3 pCn) <i>Deipnosophistae</i> 2.8 38F–39A (BT 1.90.3–9 Kaibel) 12 10.14 419A–D (BT 2.411.24–5; 412.2; 5; 10–22) 11 10.14 419C 7 no. 1 13.15–16 563E–564B (BT 3. 242.14–243.20) 13A 13.15 563F (BT 3.242.24–243.3) 7 no. 1; <i>Dicta</i> no. 1 15.16 674B 7 no. 1 15.16 674B–C (BT 3.489.21– 490.8) 10	
<i>Deipnosophistarum Epitome</i> 2.2.27.30–8 Peppink app. 11 2.2.104.35–7 app. 13A	EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS (saec. 4 pCn) <i>Praeparatio evangelica</i> 15.62.7–13 (GCS 8.2.423.26– 424.21 Mras) *35

- EUSTATHIUS THESSALONICENSIS (saec.
12 pCn)
Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem
20.407 (4.428.17–429.4 Van
der Valk) ***13B**
20.407 (4.428.20–429.1) Dicta no. 2
- GNOMOLOGIUM NEAPOLITANUM
6 (170.2–3 Sbordone) app. **41**
7 (170.4–6) app. **43**
- GNOMOLOGIUM PARISINUM
259 Sternbach app. **48**
- GNOMOLOGIUM VATICANUM
(saec. 14 pCn)
no. 46 Sternbach app. **49**
no. 120 (55.4–6) Dicta no. 7; ***41**
no. 121 (55.11) Dicta no. 8; ***42**
no. 122 (55.13–16) Dicta no. 9; ***43**
no. 123 (55.18–19) Dicta no. 10; ***44**
- PARADOXOGRAPHUS FLORENTINUS
Mirabilia de aquis
24–7 (*PGR* 320.63–70; 322.76–
94 Giannini) **17A**
Öhler p. 42.3–43.5 app. **17A**
- PARADOXOGRAPHUS VATICANUS
33 (*PGR* 340.103–6 Giannini) **17C**
- PHILODEMUS (ineunte saec. 1 aCn)
De rhetorica
PHerc. 240 fr. 16.6–12 (BT 2.277
Sudhaus) ***40**
PHerc. 1004, fr. 12.4–15 (BT
1.328–9 Sudhaus) ***38**
PHerc. 1004, col. 71.4–16 (BT
1.360) ***39**
PHerc. 1506, fr. 4.5–12 (BT 2.
197–8 Sudhaus) ***40**
- De vitiis* 1 = Περὶ κολακείας
PHerc. 222, col. 10.1–10 (*CErc*
11.108.28–31 Gargiulo) ***19**
- De vitiis* 2 = Περὶ κολακείας
PHerc. 1457, col. 11.37–42 (fr. 23)
(*CErc* 4.54.7–9 Kondo) **20**
- De vitiis* 10
PHerc. 1008, col. 10.10–35 (BT
16–18 Jensen) **21a**
PHerc. 1008, col. 10.11–13 **7** no. 5
PHerc. 1008, col. 11.1–35 (BT
18–20) **21b**
PHerc. 1008, col. 12.1–36 (BT
20–2) **21c**
PHerc. 1008, col. 13.1–38 (BT
22–4) **21d**
PHerc. 1008, col. 14.1–40 (BT
24–6) **21e**
PHerc. 1008, col. 15.1–40 (BT
26–8) **21f**
PHerc. 1008, col. 16.1–38 (BT
28–9) **21g**
PHerc. 1008, col. 17.1–36 (BT
29–31) **21h**
PHerc. 1008, col. 18.1–38 (BT
31–33) **21i**
PHerc. 1008, col. 19.1–37 (BT
33–4) **21j**
PHerc. 1008, col. 20.1–37 (BT
35–6) **21k**
PHerc. 1008, col. 21.1–39 (BT
36–8) **21l**
PHerc. 1008, col. 22.1–38 (BT
38–40) **21m**
PHerc. 1008, col. 23.1–37 (BT
40–1) **21n**
PHerc. 1008, col. 24.1–21 (BT
42–3) **21o**
- PHOTIUS (saec. 9 pCn)
Bibliotheca
167 114a14–115b17 ***30**
167 114a20 (CB 2.155.11 Henry) ***30**
- PLINIUS SECUNDUS, GAIUS (23/24–
79 pCn)
Naturalis Historia
31.15–16 (CB 32.10–16 Serbat) **17D**
- PLUTARCHUS CHAERONENSIS (saec. 1–2
pCn)

<i>Aristides</i>		SOTION PARADOXOGRAPHUS (saec. 1 pCn)	
2.2–6 (BT 1.1.251.9–252.10 Ziegler)	14A	F 24–7 (186.9–188.3 Westermann)	app. 17A
<i>Cato Maior</i>		STEPHANUS BYZANTIUS (saec. 6 pCn)	
18.4 (BT 1.1.311.19–25 Ziegler)	*34	<i>Ethnica</i>	
<i>Demosthenes</i>		s.v. Ἰουλίς (1.335.5–8 Meineke)	2B
10.2–3 (BT 1.2.289.15–24 Ziegler)	*32	STOBAEUS, JOANNES (saec. 5 pCn)	
30.1 (BT 1.2.310.6–7)	*33	<i>Anthologium</i>	
<i>Themistocles</i>		1.49.24 → PORPHYRIUS	
3.1–2 (BT 1.1.159.25–160.7 Ziegler)	14B	2.1.24	app. 46
<i>Amatorius</i>		2.2.14	7 no. 8; app. 47
21 766D–F (BT 4.382.15–383.13 Hubert)	22	2.2.18	app. 46
21 766F (BT 4.383.9–10) Dicta no. 3		2.2.22	app. 46
<i>De curiositate</i>		2.2.23	7 no. 8; app. 47
3 516E–517A (BT 3.315.12–316.3 Paton et al.)	26	2.31.83	7 no. 8; app. 47
3 516F (BT 3.315.21–3) Dicta no. 4		2.31.95	7 no. 8; app. 47
<i>De exilio</i>		3.4.109	7 no. 8; app. 47
14 605A–C (BT 3.525.23–526.15 Paton et al.)	3	3.4.110	app. 47
<i>Praecepta gerendae reipublicae</i>		3.13.40	7 no. 8; app. 47
10 804C–E (BT 5.1.74.18–75.8 Hubert)	27	3.13.57	7 no. 8; app. 47
10 804D (BT 5.1.75.4–7) Dicta no. 5		3.20.69 (3.554.20–2 Hense)	Dicta no. 12; *46
<i>Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat</i>		3.40.3/4 (3.736.8–737.4)	app. 3
= <i>De Audiendis Poetis</i>		4.15b.31 (4.392.16–19)	Dicta no. 14; *48
1 14E (BT 1.28.4–11 Paton et al.)	7 no. 2; 15	4.22a.16 (4.497.1–4)	Dicta no. 11; 45
PORPHYRIUS (saec. 3 pCn)		4.25.44	7 no. 8; app. 47
<i>De animae facultatibus</i>		4.31d.110	7 no. 8; app. 47
ap. Stobaeum 1.49.24 (1.347.21–348.10 Wachsmuth = F 251 [BT 268.14–269.6 Smith])	*29; app. 29	4.50b.83 (5.1049.5–8)	Dicta no. 15; *49
QUINTILIANUS (30/40–ca. 100 pCn)		4.52a.18 (5.1077.15–20)	7 no. 8; Dicta no. 13; *47
<i>Institutio Oratoria</i>		STRABO (saec. 1 aCn–1 pCn)	
2.15.19–20 (OCT 1.108.5–16 Winterbottom)	*37	<i>Geographica</i>	
SEXTUS EMPIRICUS (saec. 2–3 pCn)		10.5.6 486,19–24 C. (3.276.16–21 Radt)	2A
<i>Adversus mathematicos</i>		14.2.19 657–8 C. (BT 3.917.28–918.4 Meineke)	31
2.61 (BT 3.96.27–9 Mau)	*36	THEMISTIUS (ca. 317–388 pCn)	
		<i>Orationes</i>	
		21 255b–c (BT 2.35.22–36.10 Downey–Norman)	6

VARRO, MARCUS TERENTIUS (116–27 aCn)
Logistoricus: Catus De liberis educandis
 ap. Nonium 308 M.32–7 (BT
 2.481.9–14 Lindsay) **28**
 ap. Nonium 308 M.35–7 (BT
 2.481.12–14) Dicta no. 6

VITA ARISTOTELIS HESYCHII
 9 (p. 82.18–21 Düring) = VITA
 ARISTOTELIS MENAGIANA p. 402.
 20–3 Westermann **4A**; app. **4A**
 VITRUVIUS POLLIO, MARCUS (exeunte
 saec. 1 aCn)
De architectura
 8.3.21–3 (CB 20.21–22.14
 Callebat) **17B**

INDEX OF PASSAGES CITED

This index lists all passages (other than the Aristonean texts listed in the Index of Texts) cited in the upper (or lower) apparatus (app.) and (selectively) in the notes to the translation (n.).

AELIANUS, CLAUDIUS (saec. 2–3 pCn) <i>De natura animalium</i> 4.30 app. 21c <i>Varia Historia</i> 2.18 app. 11 13.44 app. 14A AESCHYLUS (525–456 aCn) <i>Septem contra Thebas</i> 822 app. 13B ALEXINUS (saec. 4 aCn) F 87 Döring app. 8 ALEXIS (saec. 4–3 aCn) T 15 PCG II app. 49 F 219 app. 11 F 256 app. 11 F 261 app. 11 ANACREON (saec. 6 aCn) F 410 PMG app. 10 ANAXANDRIDES (saec. 4 aCn) F 58 PCG II app. 12 ANTIGONUS CARYSTIUS (saec. 3 aCn) F 33A Dorandi app. 13A F 33B app. 13A p. 117 Wilamowitz app. 13A bis ANTIPATER TARSENSIS (saec. 2 aCn) F 6 SVF app. 3 ANTONIUS MELISSA (saec. 11–12 pCn) <i>Loci communes</i> 1.59 960C app. 23 2.1 1005A app. 14A APOLLODORUS ATHENIENSIS (saec. 2 aCn) F 75 Jacoby app. 25 F 76 app. 25 244 F 37 FGrH app. 25 244 F 41 app. 25 244 F 42 app. 25	APOSTOLIUS PAROEMIOGRAPHUS (saec. 14 pCn) 5.100 p. 364 app. 24A APPENDIX VATICANA 1.24 (Sternbach) app. 43 ARCHEDEMUS TARSENSIS (saec. 2 aCn) F 2 SVF app. 3 ARISTO ALEXANDRINUS see CONCORDANCES ARISTO CEUS see CONCORDANCES ARISTO CHIUS (saec. 3 aCn) see CONCORDANCES F 350 SVF = IV 1 FSA app. 47 bis F 352 app. 46 F 383 = IV 2 app. 47 F 384 = IV 3 app. 47 F 386 = IV 5 app. 47 F 387 = IV 6 app. 47 F 391 = IV 10 app. 46 F 392 = IV 11 app. 47 F 393 = IV 12 app. 46 F 394 = IV 13 app. 47 F 396 = IV 15 app. 47 F 397 = IV 16 app. 47 ARISTO COUS IUNIOR (saec. 3/2 aCn) see CONCORDANCES ARISTO ATHENIENSIS (saec. 2 aCn) 146 T 3 TrGF I app. 1 ARISTOPHANES (ca. 450–ca. 385 aCn) <i>Lysistrata</i> 887 app. 211 <i>Nubes</i> 358–63 211 n. 5 362 app. 211 <i>Pax</i> 26 app. 211 <i>Ranae</i> 107 app. 21m
---	--

115	app. 21m	2.19 43F	app. 17A
<i>Thesmophoriazusae</i>		9.67 447C	app. 21i
189–90	app. 21i ; 21i n. 3	13.90 609F	13A n. 8
ARISTOPHANES BYZANTIUS (saec.		15.42 690D–E	app. 21i
3–2 aCn)		15.9 670E–F	13A n. 7
F 404 Slater	app. 25	17 675C–E	app. 10
ARISTOPHO (saec. 4 aCn)			
F 11 PCG IV	13A n. 6	BION BORYSTHENITA (saec. 3 aCn)	
ARISTOTELES (384–322 aCn)		T 24 Kindstrand	app. 2A
<i>Apophthegmata</i>			
1 Searby	app. 48	CHARISIUS, FLAVIUS SOSIPATER (saec.	
2	app. 48	4 pCn)	
3	app. 48	<i>Ars Grammatica</i>	
4	app. 48	II, p. 198 Keil (BT 258.15–16	
5	app. 48	Barwick)	app. 18
6	app. 48	CHRYSIPPUS SOLEUS (saec. 3 aCn)	
8	app. 48	F 1 SVF	app. 3
10	app. 48	F 716	app. 22
<i>Ethica Nicomachea</i>		CHRYSTOSTOMUS, IOANNES (saec.	
1107a10–11	app. 21c	4–5 pCn)	
1108a19–23	app. 21i	<i>Eclogae ex diversis homiliis</i>	
1108b1–6	app. 21c	1–48 (PG 63.649.14–17)	app. 43
1127a13–14	app. 21i	CICERO, MARCUS TULLIUS (106–43 aCn)	
1127a23–6	app. 21h	<i>Academicae Quaestiones</i>	
<i>Politica</i>		1.16	app. 21m
1336b33–5	app. 28	<i>De natura Deorum</i>	
<i>Fragmenta</i>		1.26.72	app. 25
T 76b Düring p. 427	app. 9	<i>Tusculanae Disputationes</i>	
F 3 Düring p. 260	app. 4B	5.35.100	app. 11
F 41 Gigon = 95 Rose	app. 10	CLEANTHES ASSIUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
F 43 = 96 Rose	app. 13A	F 463 SVF	app. 3
F 777 Gigon = 4 Rose <i>Pseud.</i>	app. 48	CLEARCHUS SOLEUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
F 778 = 3 <i>Pseud.</i>	app. 48	F 22 Wehrli	app. 13A ; 13A n. 7
F 778 = 8 <i>Pseud.</i>	app. 48	F 24	13A n. 7
F 779 = 1 <i>Pseud.</i>	app. 48	CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS (saec.	
F 780 = 6 <i>Pseud.</i>	app. 48	2–3 pCn)	
F 781 = 7 <i>Pseud.</i>	app. 48	<i>Stromata</i>	
F 783 = 2 <i>Pseud.</i>	app. 48	2.23.141.5	app. 45
F 785 = 5 <i>Pseud.</i>	app. 48	CRANTOR SOLEUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
p. 10.19–22 Rose = Gigon		T 4f Mette	app. 6
p. 26a.33–6	app. 4A	CRITOLAUS PHASELITES (saec. 2 aCn)	
ATHENAEUS NAUCRATITES (saec.		F 1 Wehrli	app. 3
2–3 pCn)		F 3	app. 4A
<i>Deipnosophistae</i> (Kaibel)		F 4	app. 4B
1.58 32B	app. 12	F 30	app. 40
2.7 38C–D	12 n. 1		

CURTIIUS RUFUS, QUINTUS (saec. 1 pCn?)	7.179	app. 3
<i>Historia Alexandri Magni</i>	7.184	3 n. 3
8.4.15	app. 21d	8.4
		app. 21a
		8.36
		app. 21a
DEMADES ATHENIENSIS (saec. 4 aCn)	8.66	app. 21a
de Falco p. 12	app. 32	9.1
		app. 21a
DEMETRIUS MAGNESIUS (saec. 1 aCn)	9.3	app. 23
F 31 Mejer	app. 25	9.40
		app. 16
DEMETRIUS PHALEREUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	10.16–21	app. 16
81 no. 2 SOD	app. 18	10.28
		app. 25 bis
83	app. 21b	10.34
		app. 25; 25 n. 5
DEMOSTHENES (384–322 aCn)	10.83	app. 25; 25 n. 5
<i>Orationes</i>	10.121a	app. 25; 25 n. 5
9.12	app. 21h	DIVISIONES ARISTOTELEAE
36.45	app. 21c	p. 52.22 Mutschmann
		app. 21o
DIODORUS TYRIUS (saec. 2 aCn)		DOXOPATER, JOANNES (saec. 11 pCn)
F 1 Wehrli	app. 4B	<i>Rhet. Gr.</i> 2.226.5 Walz
		app. 24B
DIODEGENES BABYLONIUS (saec. 2 aCn)		
F 2 SVF	app. 3	EMPEDOCLES (saec. 5 aCn)
		T 88 Gallavotti
DIODEGENES LAERTIUS (saec. 3 pCn)		app. 21a
<i>Vitae Philosophorum</i>		EPICURUS (342–270 aCn)
2.32	app. 21m	F 1 Arrighetti p. 11.10–31
2.48	app. 21e	F 54 Usener
3.2	app. 25	F 95
3.41–3	app. 16	F 114
3.61	app. 25 bis; 25 n. 5	F 123 = F 48 Arrighetti
4.1	app. 16	F 232
4.3	app. 6	F 311
4.16–20	11 n. 2	Laks 1976, p. 14.25–16.17
4.22	app. 6	Usener p. 88
5.11–16	app. 16	Usener p. 104
5.27	app. 8	Usener p. 365.19–366.18
5.43	app. 18	app. 25
5.46	app. 8	ERASISTRATUS CEUS (saec. 3 aCn)
5.51–7	app. 16	F 4A Garofalo
5.52	app. 5	F 4B
5.61–4	app. 16	app. 2A
5.69–74	app. 16	app. 2B
5.81	app. 18	ETYMOLOGICUM GUDIANUM (saec. 12
7.1	app. 3	pCn)
7.13	app. 13A	328.25–7 s.v. κλιτοριάζειν
7.114	app. 21c	app. 17A
7.129	app. 22	ETYMOLOGICUM MAGNUM (saec.
7.160	45 n. 1	12 pCn)
7.161	45 n. 1	519.53–5 s.v. Κλιτόριον
7.168	app. 3	app. 17A
		EUDOXUS CNIDIUS (saec. 4 aCn)
		F 313 Lasserre
		app. 17A bis
		F 314
		app. 17D
		EUPOLIS (saec. 5 aCn)
		F 490 PCG V
		app. 21g

- EURIPIDES (ca. 484–406 aCn)
Andromacha
234 app. **21I**
Hercules Furens
1070 app. **17A**
Hippolytus
490 app. **21I**
Fragmenta
F 420.1 *TrGF* Kannicht =
F 548 Mette = *Ino* 17 Jouan
& Van Looy app. **21b**
EUSTATHIUS THESSALONICENSIS (saec.
12 pCn)
Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem
8.14 (2.516.15–517.3
Van der Valk) app. **21I**
- FGE (Page)
143(a) app. **17A**
143(b) app. **17A**
143(c) app. **17A**
- FRONTININUS, SEXTUS IULIUS (saec.
1 pCn)
Strategemata
4.6.3 app. **21d**
- GNOMOLOGIUM NEAPOLITANUM
no. 8 app. **43**
GNOMOLOGIUM VATICANUM (saec.
14 pCn)
126 Sternbach app. **43**
310 app. **23**
- HARPOCRATION (saec. 2 pCn)
Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos
μ 6 s.v. Μαργίτης Keaney app. **21k**
- HEGESANDER DELPHICUS (saec. 3 aCn)
F 26 *FHG* IV app. **13A**
F 34 app. **11**
- HERACLIDES PONTICUS (saec. 4 aCn)
F 73 Wehrli app. **15**
- HERACLITUS (saec. 6–5 aCn)
22 A 1 DK = A 1 Mondolfo
app. **23**; app. **24A**
22 A 4 DK = A 4 app. **24B**
22 B 101 DK app. **23**
- F 15(a) Marcovich app. **23**
F 15(a²) app. **23**
F 15(a³) app. **23**
F 15(a⁴) app. **23**
F 15(d²) app. **23**
F 15(d⁵) app. **23**
- HERMARCHUS MYTILENENSIS (saec.
3 aCn)
F 50 Krohn = 13 Longo app. **25**
HERMIAS IAMBGRAPHUS (saec. 3 aCn?)
p. 237 *CA* Powell **13A** n. 1
HERMIPPUS SMYRNAEUS (saec. 3 aCn)
1026 F 28 *FGrH* IV A 3 **16** n. 2
HERODOTUS (484–ca. 425 aCn)
Historiae
7.34–6 app. **21g**
HESIODUS (saec. 8/7 aCn)
Opera et Dies
519 app. **26**
Ps.-HESYCHIUS MILESIUS (saec. 6 pCn)
34 (BT 2.112.4–6 Marcovich) app. **23**
HIERONYMUS RHODIUS (saec. 3 aCn)
3 White = F 2 Wehrli app. **4A**
HIPPOBOTUS (saec. 3 aCn)
F 20 Gigante app. **23**
HOMERUS (saec. 8 aCn)
Ilias
10.401 app. **13A**
24.212–13 app. **21c**
Margites
F 3 *IEG* II West **21k** n. 4
HORATIUS FLACCUS, QUINTUS (65–8 aCn)
Epistulae
1.10.42–3 app. **22**
HYMNI HOMERICI
In Venerem
218–38 **18** n. 2
- IGM
215 app. **17A**
216 app. **17A**
217 app. **17A**
- ISIDORUS HISPALENSIS (saec. 7 pCn)
Etymologiae
13.13.2 app. **17A**; **17B** n. 6
13.13.3 app. **17A**

ISIGONUS NICAENSIS		NAUSIPHANES TEIUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
F 6 <i>PGR</i> Giannini	app. 17A	75 A 6 DK	app. 25
F 10	app. 17A	75 A 8 DK	app. 25
ISOCRATES (436–338 aCn)			
19.25	app. 21h	ORIBASIOS → RUFUS EPHESIUS	
LEUCIPPUS ELEATES (saec. 5 aCn)		OVIDIUS NASO, PUBLIUS (43 aCn–	
67 A 2 DK	app. 25	17/18 pCn)	
LUCIANUS SAMOSATENUS (saec. 2 pCn)		<i>Metamorphoses</i>	
<i>pro Lapsu inter Salutandum</i>		15.322–4	app. 17A
5	app. 21h	15.325–8	app. 17A
6	app. 25	PAMPHILUS (saec. 4 aCn)	
<i>Lexiphanes</i>		T 2 Lasserre	app. 25
12	211 n. 4	PANAETIUS RHODIUS (saec. 2 aCn)	
LUCILIUS, GAIUS (ca. 180–ca. 102 aCn)		F 124 Van Straaten = F 151	
<i>Saturae</i>		Alesse	app. 8
28.1 F 748 Krenkel	app. 28	PAPYRI	
LUCRETIUS CARUS, TITUS (ca. 95–		<i>PCairo</i> 65445,126–9	app. 21b
ca. 55 aCn)		<i>PHerc.</i> 222	19 n. 1; 20 n. 1
<i>De rerum natura</i>		<i>PHerc.</i> 1008	21a n. 1
4.1030–4	app. 22	<i>PHerc.</i> 1457	19 n. 1; 20 n. 1
LYCO PERIPATETICUS (saec. 3 aCn)		<i>PHerc.</i> 1675	19 n. 1
1 SFOD	5 n. 1	PARADOXOGRAPHUS FLORENTINUS	
1.55–6; 67–74; 122–7		12 <i>PGR</i> Giannini	app. 17A
= F 15 Wehrli	app. 5	PARADOXOGRAPHUS PALATINUS	
2	app. 3	5 <i>PGR</i> Giannini	app. 17A
3A	app. 4B	PAUSANIAS (saec. 2 pCn)	
3B = F 6 Wehrli	app. 4A	<i>Graeciae descriptio</i>	
4	app. 16	8.18.7	17A n. 4
7	app. 6	PHILEMON SYRACUSANUS (saec. 4–	
11	app. 9	3 aCn)	
23	app. 15	F 47 <i>PCG</i> VII	app. 21h
F 1 Wehrli	app. 3	PHILETAS COUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
F 1 ^I	app. 4B	T 13 Kuchenmüller = T 4 Sbar-	
F 9	app. 6	della = T 2 Dettori = T 11	
F 17	app. 9	Spanoudakis	app. 31
LYCOPHRONIDES (saec. 4 aCn)		PHILOCHORUS ATHENIENSIS (saec. 4–	
843 <i>PMG</i>	app. 13A	3 aCn)	
Ps.-MAXIMUS CONFESSOR		328 F 5b <i>FGrH</i>	12 n. 1
<i>Loci communes</i>		PHILODEMUS (ineunte saec. 1 aCn)	
9./23 p. 218 Ihm	app. 14A	<i>Academicorum Historia</i>	
49.21/56.23	app. 23	col. 24.32–6	3 n. 3
MUSONIUS RUFUS (saec. 1 pCn)		col. 25.8–11	3 n. 3
p. 43.8 –16 Hense	app. 3	col. 30.8–10	3 n. 3
		<i>De divitiis</i>	
		col. 40.8–9	app. 19

<i>De morte</i>			<i>Euthydemus</i>	
col. 13.10–11	app. 21c		274A6–7	app. 21m
<i>De oeconomia</i>			285B7–C5	app. 21n
col. 2.18	app. 21m		303C4	app. 21m
col. 5.14–15	app. 21m		<i>Gorgias</i>	
col. 8.9	app. 21c		473D3	app. 21m
<i>De poematis</i> 5			491E2	app. 21m
col. 13.28–21.22 Jensen =			494D4	app. 21m
16.28–24.22 Mangoni	29 n. 3		<i>Hippias Minor</i>	
col. 13.30 = 16.30 M.	29 n. 3		368B5–6	app. 21i
col. 20.21–6 = 23.21–6 M.	29 n. 3		372B4–7	app. 21m
<i>De rhetorica</i> 2			<i>Menexenus</i>	
col. 23.3–6 Longo	app. 19		236D4–249C8	app. 21m
<i>De rhetorica</i> 4			<i>Phaedrus</i>	
col. 25 ^a .12–4 (1.207			249D	app. 22
Sudhaus)	app. 21k ; 21k n. 4		266E6	app. 21m
<i>De rhetorica</i> 5			<i>Respublica</i>	
fr. 20.3–4 (2.159 Sudhaus)	app. 21l		1 329E	21e n. 6
<i>De vitiis</i> 2			1 329E7–330A3	app. 21e
col. 5.40	20 n. 4		1 349E11–12	app. 21o
<i>De vitiis</i> 10			2 377A11–B2	app. 28
col. 8.1–5	app. 21e		2 377C3–5	app. 28
col. 24.21–7	app. 21o		3 400E1–2	app. 21m
PHILOSTRATUS, FLAVIUS (saec. 2–3 pCn)			9 588C	app. 42
<i>Vita Apollonii</i>			9 589A–B	app. 42
7.5	app. 21b		<i>Symposium</i>	
PHILOXENUS LEUCADIUS (saec.			221B3–4	app. 21l
5–4 aCn)			<i>Theaetetus</i>	
F 836 (f) <i>PMG</i>	15 n. 1		175A7	app. 21o
PHOTIUS (saec. 9 pCn)			175E6–7	app. 21c
<i>Lexicon</i>			[PLATO]	
s.v. σεμνομυθοῦσιν (2.506.14			<i>Alcibiades</i> 2	
Porson)	app. 21l		147C–D	21k n. 4
PHYLARCHUS ATHENIENSIS (saec.			<i>Epistulae</i>	
3 aCn)			4 321C1	app. 21h
81 F 63 <i>FGrH</i>	app. 17A		<i>Sisyphus</i>	
PINDARUS (518–438 aCn)			387 B7–C3	app. 21h
<i>Isthmia</i>			<i>Platonica</i>	
1.16	app. 21e		78 Riginos (p. 123–4)	11 n. 5
<i>Olympia</i>			PLINIUS SECUNDUS, GAIUS (23/4–	
6.3–4	app. 27		79 pCn)	
<i>Pythia</i>			<i>Naturalis Historia</i>	
2.69	app. 21e ; 21e n. 5		2.230	app. 17D
PLATO (ca. 429–347 aCn)			29.4	app. 31
<i>Apologia</i>				
21D	app. 21m ; 21m n. 5			

PLUTARCHUS CHAERONENSIS (saec. 1–2 pCn)		13 807A	app. 14A
<i>Agesilaus</i>		13 807A–B	app. 14A ; 14A n. 3
8.1–2	app. 21f	13 808D	app. 21h
<i>Demetrius</i>		<i>Quaestiones convivales</i>	
41.5	app. 21d ; 21d n. 5	2.10 644B	app. 21f
41.7	app. 21c	3.1 645D–648A	app. 10
<i>Demosthenes</i>		6.1 686A–B	app. 11
29.4–7	app. 33 ; 33 n. 1	<i>Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata</i>	
<i>Dion</i>		175C–176C	app. 21d
17.9–10	app. 21b ; 21b n. 9	186A	app. 14A
<i>Lycurgus</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
22.4	app. 21e	154 Sandbach	app. 27
<i>Lysander</i>		[PLUTARCHUS]	
21.7	app. 21h	<i>Consolatio ad Apollonium</i>	
23.11–12	app. 21f	6 104A	app. 21b
30.5	app. 45	<i>De liberis educandis</i>	
<i>Pericles</i>		7 4E	app. 22
15.2	app. 21b	<i>Placita philosophorum</i>	
<i>Phocion</i>		5 905A	app. 22
5.4–5	app. 32 ; 32 n. 1	POLEMO ACADEMICUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
<i>Pyrrhus</i>		F 51 Gigante	app. 11
11.9	app. 21d ; 21d n. 5	POLLUX, IULIUS (saec. 2 pCn)	
<i>Adversus Colotem</i>		<i>Onomasticon</i> (Bethe)	
20 1118C	app. 23 bis	3.48	app. 45
<i>Amatorius</i>		4.78	app. 21e
4 750D	app. 22	8.40	app. 45
19 765C	app. 22	7.168	app. 21g
20 765F	app. 22 bis	POLYBIUS MEGALOPOLITANUS (ca. 200–118 aCn)	
<i>An seni respublica gerenda sit</i>		<i>Historiae</i>	
7 787E	app. 27	1.16.2	app. 16
<i>De curiositate</i>		3.107.10	app. 16
6 518C	app. 21c	9.1.4	app. 16
<i>De fortuna</i>		10.47.8	app. 21b
3 98B	app. 29	PRAXIPHANES MYTILENENSIS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
<i>De invidia et odio</i>		F 3 Wehrli	app. 4A
2 537A	app. 21c	F 5	app. 25
<i>De tranquillitate animi</i>		PROCLUS ATHENIENSIS (saec. 5 pCn)	
2 465D	app. 26	<i>In Platonis Alcibiadem I</i>	
4 466F	app. 22	2.223.28–30 Segonds	app. 42
<i>De tuenda sanitate praecepta</i>			
9 127A	app. 11		
<i>Praecepta gerendae reipublicae</i>		RUFUS EPHESIUS (saec. 1–2 pCn)	
7 803E	app. 32 ; 32 n. 1	apud Oribasium <i>Collectiones Medicae</i>	
10 804D–E	14A n. 3	5.3.30	app. 17A
11 805F	app. 21f ; 27 n.1	5.3.35	app. 17A

SAPPHO (saec. 7–6 aCn)	3.4.109	app. 45 ; 45 n. 1
F 94.18–20 Lobel-Page	app. 21l	3.5.42 app. 48 bis
SATYRUS OXYRHYNCHITES (saec. 3/2 aCn)	3.7.29	app. 48
<i>Vita Euripidis</i>	3.7.30	app. 48
F 39 col. 15.20–34	app. 21d	3.21.7 app. 23
F 39 col. 17.19–25	app. 21d	3.29.70 app. 48
SCHOLIA	3.29.90	app. 48
scholia in Aristophanis <i>Nubes</i>	3.38.31	app. 27
349a	app. 48	4.1.144 app. 48
SELEUCUS ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 1 pCn)	4.31c.91	app. 48
F 74 Müller p. 50–1	app. 24A	4.31d.128 app. 22
SEXTUS EMPIRICUS (saec. 2–3 pCn)	4.36.6	app. 21h
<i>Adversus mathematicos</i>	4.41.1	app. 21b
1.3–4	app. 25	4.51.28 app. 48
SGRA Laum	STRABO (saec. 1 aCn–1 pCn)	
16	<i>Geographica</i>	
SOCRATES (?469–399 aCn)	4.4.2 195,28 C. Radt	app. 21h
I C 21 SSR 1.49 Giannantoni	8.3.19 346,32–3 C.	app. 17A
	14.2.19 657–8 C. Meineke	38 n. 1
	app. 24A	
I D 1 SSR 1.213	app. 24B	STRATO LAMPACENUS (saec. 3 aCn)
T 4 Acosta Méndez & Angeli		F 3 Wehrli app. 4A
	app. 21a	F 4 app. 4B
T 5 A.–A.	app. 21l	F 4,I app. 3
SOPHOCLES (ca. 496–406 aCn)		F 10 app. 16
<i>Oedipus Coloneus</i>		F 12 app. 9
918	app. 21o	SUDA (exeunte saec. 10 pCn)
SOSICRATES RHODIUS (saec. 2 aCn)		<i>Lexicon</i>
F 12 Giannattasio Andria	app. 8	δ 400 s.v. Δηλίου κολυμβητοῦ
SOTION ALEXANDRINUS (saec. 3–2 aCn)		(LG 1.2.37.25–9 Adler) app. 24B
F 30 Wehrli	app. 23	δ 400 s.v. Δηλίου κολυμβητοῦ (LG
SPEUSIPPUS ATHENIENSIS (saec. 4 aCn)		1.2.37.20–2 et 25–9) app. 24A
F 20 Isnardi Parente = T 11		ε 2404 s.v. Ἐπικούροσ (LG
Tarán	app. 6	1.2.362.21–7) app. 25
STEPHANUS BYZANTIUS (saec. 6 pCn)		η 472 s.v. Ἡράκλειτος (LG
<i>Ethnica</i>		1.2. 583.27–8) app. 23
s.v. Ἀζανία p. 30.17–19 Meineke		σ 226 s.v. σεμνομυθοῦσιν app. 21l
	app. 17A ; 17A n. 5	
s.v. Ἀζανία p. 30.19–21	app. 17A	TERENTIUS AFER, PUBLIUS (?195–159 aCn)
s.v. Λουσοί p. 419	17A n. 4	<i>Heautontimorumenos</i>
STOBAEUS, IOANNES (saec. 5 pCn)		898 app. 28
<i>Anthologium</i>		THEMISTIUS (ca. 317–388 pCn)
2.1.24	45 n. 1	<i>Orationes</i>
2.2.22	45 n. 1	21 255a 6 n. 1
2.31.87	app. 28	THEOPHRASTUS ERESIUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)
3.1.74	app. 22	<i>Characteres</i>
		1 app. 21l ; app. 21m ; app. 21n

1.2	app. 21m	5.1 ext. 1	app. 21d
5	20 n. 4	7.5.2	app. 21e
7.2	app. 21n	VARRO, MARCUS TERENTIUS	
14.7	app. 21h	(116–27 aCn)	
15	app. 21g	F 9 Riese	app. 28
24.13	app. 21h	VITA EURIPIDIS	
29.3	app. 21m	3 (3.20–4.1 Schwartz)	app. 21d
<i>Fragmenta</i>		VITRUVIUS POLLIO, MARCUS (exeunte	
11 no. 5 FHS&G	app. 4B	saec. 1 aCn)	
11 no. 7	app. 4A	<i>De architectura</i>	
18 no. 19	app. 9	8.3.27	17B n. 8
25	app. 3		
27	app. 40	XENOPHON (<i>ca.</i> 430– <i>ca.</i> 354 aCn)	
436 no. 18	app. 18	<i>Hellenica</i>	
706	app. 32	3.4.9	app. 21f
THEOPOMPUS CHIUS (saec. 4 aCn)		<i>Memorabilia</i>	
115 F 278e <i>FGrH</i>	app. 17D	3.4.1	app. 21m
115 F 320	app. 17D	<i>Oeconomicus</i>	
THOMAS MAGISTER (saec. 14 pCn)		7–21	app. 21m ; 21m n. 8
<i>Vita Euripidis</i>			
140.29–33 Westermann	app. 21d	ZENO CITIEUS (saec. 4–3 aCn)	
THUCYDIDES (<i>ca.</i> 455– <i>ca.</i> 400 aCn)		F 1 <i>SVF</i>	app. 3
<i>Historiae</i>		F 247	app. 13A
2.65.9	app. 21b	F 248	app. 22
		F 312	app. 48
VALERIUS MAXIMUS (<i>fl. ca.</i> 31 pCn)			
4.1 ext. 3	app. 21b		

INDEX OF NAMES

The numbers refer to the translations of the fragments and to the notes (n.) to the translations.

- Abaris* **15**
 Academy **3**; **6** n. 1; **11**
 Achilles **13A** n. 5
 Aelius Tubero, Lucius **28** n. 1
 Aelius Tubero, Quintus **28** n. 1
 Aeschylus **3** n. 1; **13B**
 Aesop **15**
 Africa **17D**
 Agathon **21a** n. 4; **21i** n. 3
 Agesilaus **21f**; n. 5; **27** n. 1
 Alae **1**
 Alexander of Macedon **21d**
 Alexandria **1**
 Alexinus **8**
 Alexis, comic poet **11** n. 1; **48** n. 1; **49**
 — *Foster Brothers* **11**
 — *The Deceiver* **11**
 — *The Girl in Love* **11**
 Alliphanus in Italy **17A**
 Amphictyon, king of Athens **12** n. 1
 Amphio **5**
 Anacreon **10**
 Anaxandrides **12**
 Antigonos of Carystus
 — *Life of Zeno* **13A**
 Antipater of Tarsus **3**
 Apollodorus **25** n. 6
 — *Chronicles* **25**
 Apollodorus the Epicurean **25**
 Arcadia **17A**; **17B**
 Archedemus of Athens **3**
 Archelaus **21d**
 Argos **17A**
 Aristides, son of Lysimachus **14A**; **14B**
 Aristides of Miletus **17B** n. 8
 Aristo of Alae, treatises on rhetoric **1**
 Aristo of Alexandria **1**; **29** n. 3
 Aristo of Ceos **1**; **2B**; **3**; **4A**; **5**; n. 1; **6**; n. 1; **8**; n. 1; **3**; **7**; **9**; **12**; n. 1; **13A**; n. 4; **6**; **13B**; n. 1; **14A**; n. 1; **2**; **3**; **14B**; **16**; **17A**; **17B** n. 8; **17C**; **18** n. 6; **19** n. 3; **20** n. 4; **21a** n. 1; **22** n. 4; **23** n. 1; **24A** n. 3; **24B** n. 1; **25** n. 9; **26** n. 3; **27** n. 1; **28** n. 2; **29** n. 3; **31** n. 3; **32** n. 2; **33** n. 1; **34** n. 1; **35** n. 1; **36** n. 1; **38** n. 1; **41** n. 1; **45** n. 2; **46** n. 2; **47** n. 2; **48** n. 1
 — collector of testaments **5** n. 1; **16** n. 2
 — emulator of Bion **2A**; n. 2
 — *Erotic Examples* **7** no. 1; **8** n. 3; **10**; n. 1; **11**; **13A**
 — *Lyco* **7** no. 2; **15**
 — see also Aristo of Ceos *or* Chios
 Aristo of Chios **2A** n. 2; **6**; n. 1; **8**; n. 7; **18**; n. 6; **19** n. 3; **21a** n. 1; **22** n. 4; **23** n. 1; **24A** n. 3; **24B** n. 1; **25** n. 9; **26** n. 3; **27** n. 1; **28** n. 2; **29** n. 3; **31** n. 3; **32**; n. 2; **33** n. 1; **34** n. 1; **35** n. 1; **41** n. 1; **45**; n. 1; **2**; **46**; n. 2; **47**; n. 2; **48** n. 1
 — catalogue of writings of **1** n. 2
 — *Life of* **1** n. 2; **8** n. 1
 — manner of his death **1** n. 2
 — *Against Cleanthes* **8**
 — *Against the countercharges of Alexinus* **8**
 — *Against the Dialecticians* **8**
 — *Against the Orators* **8**; **32** n. 2
 — *Anecdotal Sayings* **8**
 — *Comparisons* **45**; n. 2; **47**
 — *Dialogues* **8**
 — *Dialogues on the doctrines of Zeno* **8** n. 2
 — *Exhortations* **8**
 — *Lectures* **8**
 — *Letters* **8**; **21a** n. 1

- Letters to Cleanthes* 8 n. 6
—*Notes* 8
—*Notes on Empty Conceit* 8; 21a n. 1
—*On the tenets of Zeno* 8
—*Talks on Love* 8
—*Talks on Wisdom* 8
—*Things to remember* 8
—see also Aristo of Ceos or Chios
Aristo of Ceos or Chios 8 n. 4; 14A n. 3;
19; 20; 21a; n. 1; 6; 8; 21b; n. 8; 21c;
21d; 21e; 21f; 21g; n. 3; 21o; 22;
23; 24A; 25; n. 6; 26; 27; 28; 29; 30
—*Comparisons* 7 no. 8
—*Life of Epicurus* 7 no. 7; 25
—*On Flattery?* 7 no. 4
—*On Heraclitus* 7 no. 6; 23
—*On Relieving Arrogance?* 7 no. 5; 21a
—*Tithonus* or *On Old Age* 7 no. 3
Aristo of Cos 31; n. 3; 38 n. 1
—pupil of the Peripatetic 31
Aristo the Peripatetic 31 n. 3
Aristo the philosopher 41; n. 1; 42; 43;
44
Aristo the Younger 36 n. 1; 38 n. 1
Aristo, musician of Athens 1
Aristo, tragic poet 1
Aristomachus 5
Aristonean commentaries 38
Aristophanes, comic poet 21i; n. 5
—*Clouds* 21i n. 5
—*Women at the Thesmophoria* 21i n. 3
Aristophanes, grammarian 25
Aristopho 13A n. 6
Aristotle of Stagira 3; 4A; 4B; 6; 9 n. 1;
13A; 16 n. 2
—*Anecdotal Sayings* 48; n. 1; 49
—*Erotica* 10
Asclepius 31 n. 1
Aspasia 21m; n. 8
Assos 3
Athenaeus 11 n. 1; 13A n. 7
—*Epitome* 12 n. 1
—*Sophists at Dinner* 12 n. 1
Athen(ian)s 1; 3; n. 1; 12 n. 1; 13B; 14A;
21b; n. 9; 21d n. 2; 32
—seminars at 3
Atticus, Titus Pomponius 18 n. 1
Babylon 3
Bacchylides 2A; 2B
Bion of Borysthenes 2A; n. 2
Borysthenes 2A
brenthys 21i; n. 3
Bulo 5; n. 1
Callinus of Hermione 5; n. 1
Carthaea on Ceos 2A
Castor 21e n. 5
castoreion 21e; n. 5
Cato, Marcus Porcius 18; n. 4
Ceos, island 1 n. 1; 2A; 2B; 3; 5; 10;
14A; n. 1; 14B n. 2; 16; 17A; n. 7;
17B; 17C n. 1; 17D
Cescum in Cilicia 17D
Chalcedon 6
Chrysippus of Soli 3; n. 3
Cicero 18 n. 1
Cilicia 17C; n. 1; 17D
Citium 3; 13A n. 2
Cleanthes of Assos 3; 6; n. 1; 8; n. 6
Clearchus
—*Erotica* 13A; n. 7
Cleon 25 n. 5
Clitomachus 3 n. 3
Clitor in Arcadia 17A; n. 4; 17B; 17D
Conon 11
Coressia on Ceos 2A
Cos, island 31; n. 1
Crantor 6; n. 1
Crates 6; n. 1; 24A
Critolaus of Phaselis 3; 4A; 4B; 36; n. 1;
37
Croton
—*The Diver* 24A
Cyclades 21e n. 6
Cyprus 13A n. 2
Delian diver 24A; 24B
Demades 32
Demetrius of Magnesia 25
Demetrius of Nicomedia 10 n. 2
Demetrius Poliorcetes 21d; n. 5

- Democritus **25** n. 8
dêmos **42** n. 1
 Demosthenes **32; 33;** n. 1
diatribê **3** n. 2; **4B** n. 1
 Dio **21b;** n. 8; 9
 Diodorus **4B**
 Diogenes of Babylon **3**
 Diogenes Laertius **3** n. 4; **8** n. 7; **16** n. 2;
 25 n. 5
 —*Life of Aristo of Chios* **1** n. 2; **8** n. 1;
 21a n. 1; **45** n. 1; **48** n. 1
 —*Life of Epicurus* **25** n. 1
 —*Life of Heraclitus* **23** n. 1; **24A** n. 3
 —*Life of Socrates* **24B** n. 1
 —*Life of Strato* **16** n. 1
 Diomedes **13A** n. 5
 Dionysius I, tyrant of Syracuse **21b;** n. 5;
 6; 9; **21d;** n. 4
 Dionysius II, tyrant of Syracuse **21b** n. 6
 Dionysus **12** n. 1
 Dolon **13A;** n. 5; **13B**
 Dorians **13B**
 Dorus **13A; 13B;** n. 1
- Elis **21i**
 Empedocles **21a**
 Eos **18** n. 2
 Epicureans **22**
 Epicurus **16** n. 2; **25;** n. 3; 5; 6; 7
 —*Letter to Eurylochus* **25**
 —*On Rhetoric* **25**
 —*The Canon* **25**
 Epirus **21d** n. 5
 Erasistratus, physician **2A;** n. 1; **2B**
 Eresus **3**
 Eros **13A** n. 1; **22**
 Eudoxus **17D**
 Euphronius of Paeania **5**
 Euripides **3** n. 1; **21a** n. 4; **21b;** n. 5; **21d**
 n. 2; **21i** n. 3; **24A; 24B**
 —*Ino* **21b** n. 7
- hairesis* **4B** n. 1
 Hector **13A** n. 5
 Hegesander
 —*Memoirs* **11; 13A**
- Hegesias **17B** n. 8
 Hellespont **21g**
 Heracleus **5**
 Heraclides
 —*Abaris* **15**
 Heraclitus **21a; 23; 24A; 24B**
 —*On Nature or Muses* **24A** n. 1
 Hermarchus, successor of Epicurus **25**
 Hermias, poet **13A** n. 1
 Hermione **5**
 Hermippus **16** n. 2
 Herodotus **3** n. 1; **17B** n. 8
 Hieronymus **4A**
 Hippias of Elis **21i; 21k**
 Hippobotus **23**
 Hippocrates **31**
 Homer **3** n. 1; **21k** n. 4
- Ischomachus **21m;** n. 8
 Isigonus **17A**
 Italy **17A**
 Iulis on Ceos **1; 2A; 2B**
 —fountain on Ceos **2B**
- Laelius, Gaius **18;** n. 5
 Lampsacus **3; 16**
 Laomedon **18** n. 2
 Leucippus **25**
 Lousoi in Arcadia **17A** n. 4
 Lucian
 —*Lexiphanes* **21i** n. 4
 Lucilius
 —Book 28 **28**
 Lyceum **3; 4B; 6**
 Lyciscus **4A**
 Lyco of the Troad **3; 4A; 4B; 5; 6;** n. 1;
 9; 16 n. 2
 —testament of **5** n. 1
 Lyco II **5**
 Lyco III nephew **5**
 Lycomedes **5**
 Lycophronides **13A**
 Lysander **21f;** n. 5; **27** n. 1
 Lysias the sage **21m**
 Lysimachus, father of Aristides **14B**

Macedon(ians) **3** n. 1; **21d**
Margites **21k**; n. 4
Megara **21b**; n. 9
Melampus **17A**; n. 4; 5; **17B**
Metrodorus **17B** n. 8
minthôn **21i**; n. 4
Myrtilus, grammarian **13A** n. 1

Nausiphanes of Teos **25**; n. 8
—*Tripod* **25**
nectar **12**
Nicias, tyrant of Cos **31**; n. 3
nous **29**
Nuus, river **17D**

Odeon **3**; n. 3
Odysseus **13A**; n. 5; **13B**
Olympus in Lydia **12**

Paeania, deme of **5**
paidika **13A**
Palladium **3**; n. 3
Pamphilus the Platonist **25**
Panaetius of Rhodes **8**; n. 7
Parthians **3**
Pericles **21b**; **21m** n. 8
Peripatetic School **3**; **4B**
Peripatetic(s) **1**; **5** n. 1; **9** n. 1; **13A**; **16**
n. 2; **17A**; **17C**; **31**; n. 3; **37**
Peripatos **2A**; **6** n. 1
—left to **5**; n. 1; 2
—scholarchs of **4A** n. 2
Persia **17A**; **17B**; **21f** n. 5
Phaedrus the fair **21m**
Phaselis **3**
Philetas **31**
Philochorus **12** n.1
Philodemus **19** n. 2; **20** n. 2; **21a** n. 1; 4;
6; 8; **21b** n. 7; 8; **21g** n. 3
—*On Beauty and Eros* **20** n. 2
—*On Poems* **5** **29** n. 3
—*On Rhetoric* **21k** n. 4; **38** n.1
—*On Vices* **8** n. 4; **19** n. 1; **20** n. 1; **21a**
n. 1; **27** n. 1
Philoxenus **15** n. 1
Phocion **32**

Phormio **4A**
Photius **30**
Pindar **21e** n. 5; **27**
Piso, Marcus Pupius **9** n. 1
Planudes, Maximus **15** n. 2
Plato **4B**; **11**; n. 5; **16** n. 2; **21i**; **25** n. 5
—death of **25**; n. 10
—*Apology* **21m** n. 5
—*Menexenus* **21m** n. 8
—*Republic* **21e** n. 6
Pliny **17B** n.6
Plutarch **3** n. 1; **14B** n. 1; **15** n. 1; **22**
n. 1; **26** n. 1; **27** n. 1; **32** n. 1; **33** n. 1
—*Life of Aristides* **14B** n. 3
—*Life of Demetrius* **21d** n. 5
—*Life of Dio* **21b** n. 9
—*Life of Phocion* **32** n. 1
—*Life of Pyrrhus* **21d** n. 5
—*Precepts of Statecraft* **14A** n. 3; **32**
n. 1
Plutarch, grammarian **13A** n. 1
Poiëssa on Ceos **2A**
Polemon the Academic **11**
Polyeuctus of Sphettus **32**; n. 1
Pontianus **13A** n. 1
Posidonius **17B** n. 8
Praxiphanes **4A**; **25**; n. 2
Praxiteles **4A**
Prodicus **21i** n. 5
Proetus, daughters of **17A**; n. 4; **17B**
Prytanis **4A**
Ptoiodorus of Megara **21b**; n. 9
Pyrrhus, king of Epirus **21d**; n. 5
Pythagoras **21a**
Pytho **5**

rhêtôr **8** n. 5
Rhodes **21e**; n. 6

Samos **25**
scholê **3** n. 2; **4A** n. 1; **4B** n. 1
Scipio Africanus, Publius Cornelius **18**;
n. 5
Seleucus, grammarian **24A**
Seriphus **21e**; n. 6
Sicily **3** n. 1

Simonides, melic poet **2A; 2B; 3** n. 1
 Simus, physician **31**
 Socrates **21a; 21i** n. 5; **21m**; n. 5; 8; **21n**;
 24A; n. 2; **24B**
 Soli **3**
 Sosicates **8**; n. 7
 Sosigenes, archon **25**
 Sotion **23**
 Spartans **21e** n. 5; **45**
 Speusippus **6**; n. 1
 Sphettus **32**
 Stagira **3**
 Stesilaus of Ceos **14A**; n. 1; **14B**
 Stoa **3; 6** n. 1
 Stobaeus **21b** n. 7; **29** n. 1; **30; 45** n. 1;
 48 n. 1
 Stoic School **3**
 Stoic(s) **3; 13A** n. 1; 3; **29** n. 3; **48**
 Strabo **2A** n. 2; **38** n. 1
 Strato of Lampsacus **3; 4A; 4B; 9; 16**;
 n. 1; 2
 —testament of **16** n. 2
 Susa in Persia **17A; 17B**
 Syracuse **21b** n. 6; 9; **21d** n. 4

 Tarsus **3**
 Teos **14B** n. 2; **25** n. 8
 Themistius **6** n. 1
 Themistocles **14A**; n. 3; **14B**; n. 1; **21e**
 n. 6

Theomnestus, harpist **31**
 Theophrastus of Eresus **3; 4A; 4B; 9**;
 n. 1; **16** n. 2; **17B** n. 8; **20** n. 4; **32**
 —*Characters* **21g** n. 3
 Theopompus **17D**
 Thesmophoria **21i** n. 3
 Thurii **3** n. 1
 Timaeus **17B** n. 8
 Timocreon of Rhodes **21e**; n. 6
 Timotheus, son of Conon **11**; n. 5
 Tithonus **18**; n. 2
 Troad **3**

 Varro, Marcus **17D**
 —*Catus* or *On the Education of Chil-*
 dren **28**; n. 1
 Vitruvius **17B** n. 4; 5; **17B** n. 2

 Xenocrates **6**; n. 1; **11** n. 2; **25**
 Xenophanes **23**
 Xenophon
 —*Oeconomicus* **21m** n. 8
 Xerxes **21g**

 Zama in Africa **17D**
 Zeno of Citium **3; 8; 13A**; n. 1; 2; **48**;
 n. 1
 Zeus **13B; 18** n. 2; **21f**
 Zeuxippus, Epicurean **22** n. 1

INDEX OF MODERN SCHOLARS

The numbers refer to the notes (n.) to the translations.

- Acosta Méndez, E. 1983 **25** n. 5
 Acosta Méndez, E. & A. Angeli 1992 **19** n. 3; **20** n. 4; **21a** n. 2; 8; **21g** n. 3; **21i** n. 1; 3; 4; 5; 6; **21m** n. 1; 7; **21n** n. 1; 5
 Alesse, F., *Panaetius* **8** n. 7
 Alfonsi, L. 1955 **15** n. 2; 3; **18** n. 6
 Alfonsi, L. 1957 **35** n. 1; **47** n. 2
 Angeli, A. **21a** n. 2; 3
 Angeli, A. 1994 **19** n. 1
 Acosta Méndez, E. & A. Angeli
 Arnim, H. von, *SVF* I **8** n. 7; **18** n. 6; **22** n. 4; **23** n. 1; **24A** n. 3; **24B** n. 1; **25** n. 9; **26** n. 3; **27** n. 1; **28** n. 2; **29** n. 3; **32** n. 2; **33** n. 1; **34** n. 1; **35** n. 1; **41** n. 1; **45** n. 2; **46** n. 2; **47** n. 2
 Arnim, H. von 1900 **38** n. 1
 Arnott, G. 2000 **12** n. 1
 Arrighetti, G., *Epicurus* **25** n. 1

 Bollansée, J. **16** n. 2
 Brink, K.O., *RE* **4A** n. 2
 Brunschwig, J. 1999 **24A** n. 2
 Bücheler, F. **46** n. 2
 Büchner, W. **21i** n. 6; **21m** n. 6
 Bywater, I. **31** n. 3

 Callebat, L., *Vitruvius* **17A** n. 2; **17B** n. 6; 8
 Capasso, M. 1997 **19** n. 1; **20** n. 1
 Casanova, F. **19** n. 1
 Caterino, L. **21a** n. 1
 Caujolle-Zaslowsky, F. & R. Goulet **8** n. 7; **18** n. 6; **31** n. 3
 Cobet, C.G. **25** n. 6
 Cobet, C.G. 1874 **21d** n. 2
 Corvisier, J.-N. 2000 **10** n. 2
 Crönert, W. **15** n. 2
 Crönert, W. *KuM* **23** n. 1; **24A** n. 3; **25** n. 9
 Dahlmann, H. 1941 **28** n. 2
 Dahlmann, H. 1956 **28** n. 1
 Delattre, D. **21b** n. 5; **21m** n. 2
 Diggle, J. **21g** n. 3
 Dorandi, T. **19** n. 3; **20** n. 4; **21a** n. 1; 2; 3; 8; **21g** n. 3; **21o** n. 4
 Dorandi, T. & M. Stein 1984 **20** n. 1

 Edelstein, L. 1955 **15** n. 2; **22** n. 4; **26** n. 3; **27** n. 1; **29** n. 3; **36** n. 1
 Ellis, R. 1876 **17A** n. 2
 Falco, V. de, *Demades* **32** n. 2
 Festa, N., *FSA* II **8** n. 4; 7
 Fornara, Ch.W. 1966 **18** n. 6

 Gallavotti, C. 1927 **19** n. 3; **21a** n. 1; **21f** n. 7; **21g** n. 3; **21h** n. 5; **21j** n. 5; **21k** n. 2
 Gallavotti, C. 1933 **21a** n. 1
 Gargiulo, T. 1981 **19** n. 1; 3
 Gercke, A. 1892 **18** n. 6; **21a** n. 1; **45** n. 2
 Gercke, A., *RE* **16** n. 2; **28** n. 2; **31** n. 3; **38** n. 1
 Gerhard, G.A. 1905 **25** n. 5
 Giannattasio Andria, R., *Sosicrates* **8** n. 7
 Giesecke, A. 1891 **8** n. 4; **21a** n. 1
 Giesecke, A. 1892 **18** n. 6; **45** n. 2
 Gigante, M. 1961 **25** n. 5
 Gigante, M. 1996a **15** n. 2; 3; **23** n. 1
 Gigante, M. 1996b **21a** n. 1; **21o** n. 4
 Gigante, M. 1997b **21g** n. 4; **21h** n. 3; **21i** n. 4; **21l** n. 2; n. 6; **21o** n. 2
 Gigante, M. 1998 **21k** n. 4
 Gigante, M. 2000a **21i** n. 3; **21l** n. 5
 Gigante, M. 2000b **19** n. 1
 Gigon, O. *Aristoteles* **48** n. 1

- Gigon, O. 1958 **16** n. 2
Gigon, O. 1959 **15** n. 3; **22** n. 4
Glucker, J., *Antiochus* **3** n. 2; **4B** n. 1
Gomperz, Th. **46** n. 2
Gottschalk, H.B. 1972 **5** n. 2; **16** n. 2
Gottschalk, H.B. 1973 **31** n. 3; **41** n. 1
Gottschalk, H.B. 1980 **28** n. 1; 2
Grilli, A. 1971 **29** n. 3
Guérard, C. **8** n. 7
- Hahm, D. **8** n. 7; **15** n. 3; **22** n. 4; **23** n. 1; **26** n. 3; **31** n. 3; **45** n. 2
Hartung, J.A. **21n** n. 5
Hecker, A. 1852 **17A** n. 2; 5
Heinze, R. 1890 **45** n. 2
Helmbold, W.C., *Plutarch* **22** n. 2
Hense, O., *Stobaeus* **48** n. 1
Hense, O. 1890 **26** n. 3; **45** n. 2
Heringa, A. 1749 **17A** n. 6
Hubert, C., *Plutarch* **22** n. 2
- Ioppolo 1980 **2A** n. 2; **8** n. 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; **15** n. 3; **18** n. 6; **22** n. 4; **23** n. 1; **24A** n. 3; **24B** n. 1; **25** n. 9; **27** n. 1; **28** n. 2; **29** n. 3; **32** n. 2; **34** n. 1; **35** n. 1; **41** n. 1; **45** n. 2; **47** n. 2
Ioppolo, A.M. 1996 **21a** n. 1; **21l** n. 6
- Jacoby, F. 1902 **23** n. 1; **24A** n. 3; **25** n. 9
Jensen, C. 1911 **19** n. 3; **20** n. 4; **21a** n. 1; 8; **21b** n. 9; **21d** n. 2; 4; **21e** n. 1; 3; **21f** n. 5; **21g** n. 3; **27** n. 1
Jensen, C. apud Knögel **21b** n. 4; 5; 8
Jensen, C., *Po.* **29** n. 3
Jensen, C., *Vit.* **21a** n. 1; **21d** n. 4; **21e** n. 6; **21f** n. 3; **21n** n. 5
Jouan, F. **21b** n. 7
- Kindstrand, J.F., *Bion* **2A** n. 2
Kirk, G.S., *Heraclitus* **23** n. 1; **24A** n. 2
Kleve, K. 1983 **21l** n. 6; **21m** n. 7
Knögel, W. 1933 **9** n. 2; **10** n. 1; **14A** n. 3; **16** n. 2; **17A** n. 1; **18** n. 6; **19** n. 3; **20** n. 4; **21a** n. 1; 7; 8; **21b** n. 5; 7; 8; 11; **21d** n. 6; **21f** n. 5; **21g** n. 3; 4; **21h** n. 3; **21i** n. 4; **21k** n. 2; 3; 5; 7; **21l** n. 1; 2; 3; 4; 6; **21m** n. 1; 3; **21o** n. 2; **22** n. 4; **23** n. 1; **24A** n. 3; **24B** n. 1; **25** n. 9; **26** n. 3; **27** n. 1; **28** n. 2; **29** n. 3; **31** n. 3; **32** n. 2; **33** n. 1; **34** n. 1; **35** n. 1; **41** n. 1; **45** n. 2; **46** n. 2; **47** n. 2; **48** n. 1
Kondo, E. 1974 **20** n. 4
- Laks, A. 1976 **25** n. 1; 2; 4; 5; 6; 9
Lancia, M. 1980 **2A** n. 2; **18** n. 6; **22** n. 4
Longo Auricchio, F. 1986 **19** n. 1
Looij, H. van **21b** n. 7
- Mangoni, C., *Po.* **29** n. 3
Mansfeld, J. 1985 **29** n. 3; **35** n. 1; **45** n. 2
Marcovich, M. *Diogenes Laertius* **24A** n. 2
Mariotti, I., *Aristone d'Alessandria* **29** n. 3; **36** n. 1
Mayer, A. 1907–10 **21a** n. 1; **22** n. 4; **27** n. 1; **28** n. 2; **32** n. 2; **34** n. 1; **35** n. 1; **38** n. 1; **39** n. 1
Meineke, A. **13A** n. 6
Mondolfo, R., *Heraclitus* **23** n. 1; **24A** n. 2
Moraux, P. 1951 **16** n. 2
Mouraviev, S.N. 1987 **23** n. 1
Mras, K. 1955 **35** n. 1; **45** n. 2
Müller, R. 1938 **28** n. 1; 2
- Nardelli, M.L. 1984 **21l** n. 6
- Öhler, H. 1913 **17A** n. 2
- Page, D.L., *FGE* **17A** n. 2; **17A** n. 3; 9; **17B** n. 2
Pasquali, G. 1918 **21g** n. 3
Philippson, R. 1912 **21a** n. 1; **21b** n. 2; 4; 5; 6; **21c** n. 2; **21f** n. 2; **21k** n. 8
Philippson, R. 1921 **25** n. 6
Philippson, R. 1934 **18** n. 6; **21b** n. 5; **23** n. 1; **27** n. 1
Philippson, R. 1938 **21o** n. 4
Pohlenz, M., *Die Stoa* **29** n. 3
Porter, J.I. 1994 **29** n. 3

- Pothecary, S. 1997 **31** n. 3
Powell, J.G.F., *Cicero* **18** n. 3; 6
Preger, T., *IGM* 1891 **17A** n. 2; **17B** n. 2
Ranocchia, G. **21a** n. 1; 2; 8; **21g** n. 3
Ranocchia, G. 2001 **21n** n. 5
Ranocchia, G. 2003 **18** n. 3
Reutern, G. von 1933 **15** n. 2
Riginos, A.W. *Platonica* **11** n. 5
Ritschl, F. 1842 **18** n. 6; **45** n. 2
Rose, V., *Pseud.* **48** n. 1
Rose, V., *Vitruvius* **17B** n. 2; 6
Rostagni, A. 1955 **21a** n. 1
Rusten, J. **21g** n. 3; **21j** n. 3; **21m** n. 2;
21n n. 2; 3
Sauppe, H. 1853 **21a** n. 1; **21d** n. 4; **21i**
n. 2; **21j** n. 6; 7; **21n** n. 5; 6
Searby, D.M. **41** n. 1; **43** n. 1; **45** n. 2
Searby, D.M. *Aristoteles* **48** n. 1; 2; **49**
n. 2
Sedley, D.N. **21d** n. 4
Serbat, G. *Plinius* **17B** n. 6
Sharples, R.W. **17A** n. 1; 3; 8; **17B** n. 8;
17C n. 1
Sharples, R.W., *DNP* **29** n. 3; **31** n. 3
Smith, A., *Porphyrius* **29** n. 3
Sollenberger, M.G. 1992 **16** n. 2
Sommerstein, A.H. **21i** n. 5
Spengel, L. **21j** n. 3
Sternbach, L. *GV* **41** n. 1
Susemihl, F., *GGL* **18** n. 6; **31** n. 3
Tsouna, V. **21a** n. 1; **21g** n. 3
Tsouna, V. 2004 **21a** n. 1; **21b** n. 5; 7;
10; **21d** n. 4; **21e** n. 3; **21j** n. 3; **21m**
n. 2; **21n** n. 3
Ussing, J.L. 1868 **21d** n. 4; **21d** n. 6; **21h**
n. 6; **21j** n. 3; 6; **21m** n. 9; **21n** n. 2
Vogt, S. **21g** n. 3
Wachsmuth, C., *Stobaeus* **29** n. 2; 3
Weber, H. 1896 **45** n. 2
Wehrli, F., *Aristo Ceus* **4A** n. 2; **8** n. 3; 7;
9 n. 2; **10** n. 1; **13A** n. 4; **15** n. 2; 3;
17A n. 1; **18** n. 6; **20** n. 4; **21a** n. 1;
21d n. 2; **21g** n. 3; 4; **21h** n. 3; **21i**
n. 4; **21i** n. 6; **22** n. 4; **23** n. 1; **24A**
n. 3; **24B** n. 1; **25** n. 9; **26** n. 3; **27**
n. 1; **28** n. 2; **29** n. 3; **31** n. 3; **32** n. 2;
33 n. 1; **34** n. 1; **35** n. 1; **41** n. 1; **45**
n. 2; **46** n. 2; **47** n. 2
Wehrli, F. *Aristo Junior* **31** n. 3; **36** n. 1;
38 n. 1
Wehrli, F. *RE* **8** n. 7; **10** n. 1
Wilamowitz, U. von, *Sappho und Semo-*
nides **21e** n. 6
Zeller, E. 1921 **16** n. 2; **18** n. 6; **22** n. 4;
27 n. 1; **29** n. 3; **31** n. 3; **36** n. 1; **45**
n. 2
Zucchelli, B. 1981 **28** n. 1

Tsekourakis, D. 1980 **2A** n. 2; **8** n. 7; **22**
n. 4



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

2

In Search of Aristo of Ceos

David Hahm

In searching for an ancient philosopher whose works have all been lost one turns instinctively to Diogenes Laertius to find a biography; but for the Peripatetic Aristo of Ceos—alas—there is none. Diogenes' series of Peripatetic lives stops just short of Aristo, with his older associate, Lyco. There are, however, a few references to him, in Diogenes and various other authors. These references, collected by Fritz Wehrli in 1952, have served as the basis for current accounts of Aristo's writings, apophthegms, philosophical thought, and his role in the Peripatos.¹ Wehrli himself in his commentary to his edition and in his 1968 article in Pauly-Wissowa laid the foundation for the present day portrait of Aristo. Subsequent accounts have followed with few modifications. From Wehrli's collection of texts we might sketch a portrait like the following: Aristo of Ceos was an associate of Lyco of Troas in the Peripatos and his successor after his death. He was the author of many writings, among which were *Lyco*, *Erotic Examples*, *On Relieving Arrogance*, a work on old age, and quite possibly a few more whose titles ended up in a bibliography of a Stoic philosopher of the same name. He also wrote a history of philosophy or biographies of earlier philoso-

¹ Wehrli (1952), (1968), and reaffirmed in (1983).

phers, including the leaders of the Peripatos, in which he preserved the wills of his predecessors. In addition, he apparently wrote about politics, laws, and education. References to these writings allow us to construct at least a modest outline of his contributions to the history of the Peripatos during the last quarter of the third century BCE. That is not much; but the light it sheds on an obscure period is welcome. Yet there remains a nagging suspicion that we may know less than we think.²

1. Problems of Identification

There are two fundamental problems besetting our understanding of the identity and achievement of Aristo of Ceos: (1) There are many references in ancient sources simply to “Aristo” without any definitive identification. Since there were at least two well-known philosophical writers named Aristo, a Peripatetic from Ceos and a Stoic from Chios, it is essential to know to which Aristo the unidentified references apply. Of Wehrli’s 24 fragments (as distinct from his testimonia), two-thirds are attributed only to Aristo without further identification. (2) Even when Aristo is fully identified as to place of origin or philosophical school in an ancient source, we must worry whether the ancient source has attributed the reference correctly. Diogenes Laertius provokes suspicion when he lists the titles of works by the Stoic Aristo of Chios and then adds that Panaetius and Sosicrates attributed all these titles (except some letters) to Aristo of Ceos (D.L. 7.163 = 8).

As a result, more than a century of debate has produced no consensus. A good example is the vigorous debate over Cicero’s remark in the *Cato* that he was not going to assign his whole speech about old age to Tithonus, as Aristo did (*Cato* 1.3 = 18). Ironically, Cicero did add a place of origin to identify which Aristo wrote this work, but textual corruptions have rendered the original manuscript reading indeterminable. As more and better arguments have been marshaled, the discussion has gotten more elaborate. In 1980, Anna Maria Ioppolo in her study of Aristo of Chios devoted 16 pages to proving Cicero was referring to the Stoic from Chios. She refuted seven arguments that had been used to assign the reference to the Cean and argued at length in favor of assign-

² Edelstein (1955) raised serious questions in his review shortly after the publication of Wehrli’s edition.

ing the reference to the Stoic.³ In 1988, Jonathan Powell in his edition of the *Cato* reviewed twelve arguments and found all either inconclusive or weighing in favor of the Peripatetic.⁴

The inconclusiveness of the debate about this reference and most of the other disputed texts results from the method typically used to address the two besetting problems of incompletely specified references and potential confusion between two (or possibly more) different authors of the same name. The practice of collecting fragments and reconstructing lost works goes back to the Renaissance and, as it was developed, was modeled on the collection of architectural and archaeological artifacts and the reconstruction of ruined buildings, sculptures, vases, and inscriptions.⁵ In accord with the architectural model, the goal was first to extract the pieces of early fragmented texts from the later matrices in which they have been preserved and then to reconstruct as much as possible of the original by joining fragments together wherever possible, or, where they do not connect, by filling gaps with imaginative extrapolation from surviving fragments.

On this model, an incompletely identified reference, where only the bare name is known, can be attributed to one of the Aristos by its similarity or dissimilarity to the references that are completely identified and securely assigned. So Cicero's criticism of the lack of authority inherent in the use of the mythological spokesperson in Aristo's work on old age can be compared to his remarks in *De finibus* on the lack of authority in Aristo of Ceos's literary style with the inference that Cicero is referring to the same Aristo (*Fin.* 5.13 = **9**).⁶ If there is no exact parallel among the attributed references and hence nothing to which to compare it, one can look for similarities to the words or ideas of other members of the same school. This turns out to be the primary basis for attributing references that are made to an unspecified Aristo. So, for example, the fragments of biographies of philosophers attributed by Diogenes Laertius to an unspecified Aristo (9.5 = **23**, 9.11 = **24A**, 10.14 = **25**) are assigned to Aristo of Ceos on the grounds that Peripatetics

³ Ioppolo (1980) 292–308.

⁴ Powell (1988) 269–72.

⁵ Cf. Mansfeld (1998) 28 and n. 106. Dionisotti (1997) and Grafton (1997) discuss the history and methodological assumptions of collecting fragments at length. Dionisotti additionally considers the medieval background and objectives.

⁶ E.g. Powell (1988) 269.

were frequently interested in biography, whereas Stoics were not, or so it is assumed.⁷

There are several problems inherent in this procedure, and it is not hard to see why the conclusions are often inconclusive. How similar do two texts have to be to justify assigning them to the same author (i.e., to the same Aristo)? Even if the similarity is very close, is similarity alone enough to rule out attribution to the other? Is it not possible that the other Aristo may have held the same point of view? Can one establish attribution in the absence of concrete evidence of dissimilarity to the other candidate? Or viewed from the other direction, is even a clear difference from one Aristo enough to establish attribution to the other? What if there was a third or fourth Aristo for whom we have no surviving evidence?

The same questions arise with respect to comparing schools of thought. How do we know what was acceptable and what was unacceptable in the Peripatos at the time of Aristo of Ceos, when we know so little about him and his contemporaries? How much diversity was prevalent in Stoic and Peripatetic circles in the third century BCE? Furthermore, how many Aristos were there who wrote philosophy and might show up among the unspecified Aristos? Diogenes lists three philosophers named Aristo, and one rhetorician (7.164 = **1**); Strabo lists one or two more (10.5.6 = **2A**, 14.2.19 = **31**, 17.1.5).⁸ The *Index Academicorum* lists even more Aristos (N.14–15, 29.4). In fact, four were members of the Academy at the same time (O.25–9).⁹ Aristo was apparently a common name. Should we assign all these citations only to the two most famous Aristos?

Finally, how much context before and after a quotation should be used in interpreting or comparing a fragment? In Plutarch (*Amat.* 766E = **22**) an unspecified Aristo is cited for the phrase “as a well-fitted shoe reveals the lovely foot.”¹⁰ Plutarch used this phrase as an analogy to the way good character becomes transparent in a beautiful physical form.

⁷ E.g. Wehrli (1952) 65 on frs. 28–32, (1968) 159, (1983) 580, followed by Sharples (2002) 1119–20, Fortenbaugh (1997) 56. In this case, the attribution can be supported by Diogenes’ assertion that Aristo of Ceos passed on the wills of earlier Peripatetics (D.L. 5.64 = **16**).

⁸ See below p. 203–5.

⁹ The text has been edited most recently by Dorandi (1991) 157–8, 166.

¹⁰ The reference is almost certainly to Aristo of Chios; cf. Edelstein (1955) 416. I mention it only because Wehrli included it in his edition.

Can we assume Plutarch's Aristo used this homely example as an analogy for the same thing? Or was Aristo responsible only for an observation of the relationship of a shoe to a foot?

With so much room for subjectivity it is little wonder that no consensus has emerged regarding Aristo's writings or thought. I do not wish to disparage this established methodology of reconstructing the work of lost authors. It has shed welcome light on many lost authors and works. I only wish to call attention to its limitations, which are such that in cases where securely attributed references are few, the element of subjectivity rises to a level at which reconstruction cannot claim probability; the most we can achieve is the construction of several equally plausible possibilities.¹¹ I see that as the current state of the question regarding the attribution of incompletely identified references.

There is, however, an alternative methodology for dealing with lost texts, one that has been refined over the last half century, but that has been applied in only a limited way to the references to Aristo. It is the methodology that treats a reference to a lost text, not as a physical artifact, inscribed, or potentially inscribed, on a physical material (paper or stone), but rather as a mental artifact, an artifact of human memory. This methodology is modeled on the practice of detection, exemplified in criminal investigation and investigative journalism. Here the references in existing texts to other texts are not extracted and isolated from their context to create "fragments," but are all treated along with their contexts as potential witnesses to the persons and texts of which they are witnesses. To use the accepted distinction: all references are essentially *testimonia* and their value as evidence must be tested by interrogating the extant author's text to determine what the author remembers of, or has heard about, the person or text under investigation, as well as how the author uses what he recalls.¹²

In this paper I would like to survey the major sources of information on Aristo of Ceos to determine what they knew about him, whether they can discriminate Aristo of Ceos from other Aristos, and to which Aristo

¹¹ The problems and issues involved in collecting and interpreting fragments are discussed from various points of view in Most (1997).

¹² See, e.g., Laks (1997) and Osborne (1987) on reading references in context. An example of the application of the method is Kidd's edition of and commentary on Posidonius, a well-attested Hellenistic author whose text by a quirk of history escaped being collected as fragments until relatively recently; cf. Hahm (2001). For analysis of the issues see Kidd (1997).

they may have thought they were referring when they alluded to an Aristo without further identification. These authors drew on several different traditions and selected from the traditions with various individual goals, biases, and grounds for selection. An awareness of the biases of the authors and the traditions from which they drew may help assess the relevance of their testimony to the life, writings, or thought of Aristo of Ceos.

2. The Historiographical Tradition: Diogenes Laertius

I will begin with Diogenes Laertius because he represents the tradition of constructing philosophical successions, the tradition that ultimately authorizes any investigation of the successors of Aristotle. Though Diogenes records no biography of Aristo, he does provide some of the little we know of Aristo's career. In Diogenes' transcript of Lyco's will, we learn that Aristo was among Lyco's ten associates (γνώριμοι) to whom he left the Peripatos (5.70 = 5).¹³ Aristo's position in the list of associates, namely third, suggests that Aristo was among Lyco's closest associates. The position seems to be significant. The two enumerated ahead of him, Bulon and Callinus, were obviously among the most important people to Lyco. He bequeathed a house to them jointly and appointed them to pay his medical and funeral expenses. Callinus received a bequest of household items and was entrusted with publishing Lyco's unpublished writings. Callinus also witnessed Lyco's will. Aristo assisted Callinus in this along with Euphronius of Paeania, who was apparently not an associate of the school (5.70–4 = Lyco fr. 1 SFOD). As one of the prominent associates of the school and one of three unrelated friends who witnessed his will, Aristo had obviously earned Lyco's trust. This is confirmed by Themistius, who preserves a touching story of Lycos' affection for Aristo and his approbation of Aristo's philosophical achievement (*Orat.* 21.255B = 6 = Lyco fr. 2 SFOD).

Lyco's will left the leadership of the school open, saying, "The members shall place in charge whoever they believe will persevere in the work (of the school) and who will be best able to hold it together" (5.7 = 5). Diogenes nowhere tells us who actually succeeded Lyco, even

¹³ On the contents of the will see Gottschalk (1972) 317–21 and Sollenberger (1992) 3870–1.

though his work is dedicated to tracking the succession of philosophers in each school as far as his sources allowed. His omission cannot be due to the loss of records, for the Peripatetic succession after Lyco was well-known. It is reported by Cicero (*Fin.* 5.13 = **9**), Plutarch (*Exil.* 605B = **3** = Lyco fr. 2 SFOD), Clement (1.14.63.4 = Lyco fr. 3A SFOD), and Hesychius (*Vit. Arist.* 9 = **4A** = Lyco fr. 3B SFOD). Though these four do not completely agree, they make it virtually certain that Aristo was Lyco's successor and that Critolaus followed, either immediately or after another unidentified individual.¹⁴ They also show that accounts of the succession of Peripatetics were available at the time that Diogenes wrote. Cicero and Plutarch knew the course of the succession through Aristo and Critolaus long before Diogenes wrote. That forces us to ask why Diogenes does not record anything after Lyco.

The most natural answer is that his particular source for the Peripatetic book did not go beyond Lyco.¹⁵ We know Diogenes followed his sources closely even at the cost of inconsistency. In his prologue, he traces what he identifies as the three branches of the Ionian line of philosophers down to Clitomachus in the Academy, Chrysippus in the Stoa, and Theophrastus in the Peripatos (1.13–15). Yet when he comes to treat the Peripatetic school in Book 5, he extends the succession several scholarchs beyond Theophrastus. This indicates that his particular source for the Peripatetics was different from the source for his preliminary outline. We have to conclude that Diogenes' source or sources for his succession of heads of the Peripatos ended with Lyco.¹⁶

¹⁴ This is the import of Cicero's and Plutarch's lists, the earliest of the recorded successions. Clement omits Aristo, but adds Diodorus after Critolaus. Hesychius interpolates additional names, viz., Praxiteles between Strato and Lyco, and Lyciscus, Praxiphanes, Hieronymus, Prytanis, and Phormio between Aristo and Critolaus. These were perhaps students or other associates of the Peripatos that were included in the original catalogue of Peripatetics and at some point mistaken for members of the succession of leaders. For a discussion and convenient table see Brink (1940) 908–10; cf. Lynch (1972) 140–1 n. 12. The gap of 70 years between the death of Lyco and the one date attested for Critolaus (155 BCE, when he visited Rome) has raised the question whether Critolaus followed immediately after Aristo. If he did not, we might search for an intervening leader in the extra names in the *Vita*, but we have no way of guessing who it might have been.

¹⁵ Cf. e.g., Moraux (1951) 243–5, Sollenberger (1992) 3799. This view has been commonplace at least since Zeller (1897) 2.478 n. 4.

¹⁶ Diogenes goes on with two more lives, but they are two additional fourth-century students of the Peripatos, Demetrius of Phalerum and Heracleides Ponticus.

This fact suggests a possible connection with another of Diogenes' pieces of information about Aristo of Ceos. Diogenes tells us that Strato's will came from a collection of wills made by Aristo of Ceos (5.64 = **16**). It seems reasonable to suppose that if Aristo was the ultimate source for Strato's will, he was probably also the source for the other three wills, those of Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Lyco.¹⁷ That would explain why Diogenes records no wills after Lyco's. It also suggests a hypothesis for why no lives of Peripatetic philosophers after Lyco are found in Diogenes. If Aristo was Diogenes' source for his lives of all the Peripatetics, whether directly or indirectly, we have a credible explanation both for the extent of the book and for the preservation of something as private as the wills of the leaders. We then may also have another bit of information about Aristo's literary production, namely, that he wrote a history of the Peripatetic school. This hypothesis has found some acceptance. But it is also fraught with difficulty.¹⁸

The hypothesis that Aristo was the source of both the wills and the rest of the material for Diogenes' Peripatetic lives rests on the fact that both end with Lyco. But that can be explained just as easily by the hypothesis that Diogenes used an intermediate biography that attributed the source of the wills to Aristo. Diogenes introduces three of the wills with a verb expressing his personal involvement in their discovery: "I found" (εὑρον, 5.51; περιετύχομεν, 5.11, 5.69). Diogenes rarely intrudes upon his story in his own voice. When he does, it is frequently to express an antiquarian predilection on his part.¹⁹ Sometimes he observes that some ancient artifact was still in existence. At other times, he expresses satisfaction at finding even a written record of an antiquarian artifact, when it was not commonly known in the biographical literature. His discovery of the wills falls into the latter category.

From that one might be tempted to conjecture that Diogenes himself had seen Aristo's work. But the wording of Aristo's role in the transmission of the wills militates against this: "In accord with what, I suppose (πουν), Aristo of Ceos also (καί) collected" (5.64 = **16**). The πουν ("I suppose," or perhaps "somewhere") suggests that Diogenes had some

¹⁷ Zeller (1897) 2.478 n. 4, Brink (1940) 912, Moraux (1951) 243–5, Wehrli (1952) 21, (1968) 580, Gottschalk (1972) 315, Gigante (1996) 18, Fortenbaugh (1997) 56.

¹⁸ It is accepted by, e.g., Brink, Moraux, Wehrli, and Gigante, though not by Gottschalk and Fortenbaugh (all above, n. 17). The problems have been elucidated by Sollenberger (1992) 3860–1.

¹⁹ Mejer (1978) 53–4.

uncertainty about Aristo's work. The καί may suggest that Diogenes did not regard Aristo as the only one to record the text of the wills, but that he also counted the author who quoted Aristo. Moreover, Aristo is nowhere else cited for any of Diogenes' information on the Peripatos. Aristo's role might have been as little as giving a contemporary biographer (Hermippus?) access to the wills in the school or passing on a transcript of them.²⁰

But before we dismiss Aristo as a historian of philosophy, we have to consider several passages in which Diogenes appears to have cited an unidentified Aristo as the source of information on the death of Heraclitus from a book "On Heraclitus" (9.5 = **23**), of an anecdote regarding Socrates' opinion of Heraclitus (9.11 = **24A**; cf. 2.22 = **24B**), and of information about Epicurus' teachers and the founding of his school from a book "On Epicurus" (10.14 = **25**). Here we encounter our first unspecified Aristo. Diogenes in his biography of the Stoic Aristo of Chios enumerated six other Aristos who had written literature and thus presumably had come within the scope of the biographical tradition in which Diogenes was working. The first of these he identified as Aristo of Iulis (7.164). This, of course, was Aristo of Ceos, since Iulis was the chief city on the island of Ceos. Did Diogenes realize he was referring to the same person under two different names or did he just copy it from his source? It is impossible to say. After naming three more Aristos, a musician, a tragedian, and an author of rhetorical treatises, he named another philosopher, Aristo of Alexandria, and identified him as a Peripatetic.²¹ Regardless of whether Diogenes ever tried to harmonize the Aristo he was quoting with the members of this list, we have to conclude that the tradition from which Diogenes drew his material knew of at least three philosophers named Aristo. We have no way of knowing how many more Aristos did not make it into this catalogue.²²

This fact makes it impossible to assume anything a priori when we encounter an unidentified Aristo in Diogenes or any other author. Diogenes composed his work by excerpting books he read and arrang-

²⁰ This is the suggestion of Sollenberger (1992) 3861.

²¹ Cf. Mejer (1978) 38–9. The ultimate source may have been Demetrius of Magnesia, who wrote "On Poets and Writers of the Same Name" in the mid-first century BCE. On Aristo of Alexandria see Mariotti, and Moraux (1973) 1.181–93.

²² Pauly-Wissowa lists 66 Aristos. For discussion of other Aristos in Strabo, see below p. 203–5.

ing those excerpts under his chosen topics.²³ As an excerptor he had little reason to try to identify which Aristo it was that wrote about Heraclitus, Socrates, and Epicurus. In fact, we cannot even assume that the three references came from the same Aristo. If among the sources from which Diogenes' information came there were at least three Aristos with an interest in philosophy, the identification of the Aristo (or Aristos) who wrote the biographical statements becomes impossible to fix on the basis of Diogenes' authorial practices. We have to find a different approach to identify his source.

We might be able narrow the field by appealing to a chronological criterion. Diogenes tells us that Aristo's discussion of Heraclitus was quoted by Sotion (D.L. 9.5 = **23**). Sotion of Alexandria wrote an influential *Successions of the Philosophers* that was used extensively by Diogenes.²⁴ Diogenes' excerpt from Sotion is cited in direct discourse and comprises two assertions: (1) that some people say Heraclitus heard Xenophanes and (2) that Aristo in "On Heraclitus" claimed that Heraclitus was cured of dropsy and died of something else. This might help establish the identity of Aristo in that if Sotion quoted an Aristo, that Aristo must have been earlier than Sotion.

Sotion is almost always dated ca. 200 BCE. This dating is based on two facts: (1) that the latest datable author cited by him was Chrysippus, who died in 208/4 BCE (D.L. 7.183–4 = *SVF* 2.1), and (2) that Sotion's *Successions* was epitomized by Heraclides Lembos (D.L. 5.79, 8.7, 10.1).²⁵ Heraclides Lembos thus provides Sotion's *terminus ante quem*. Heraclides' date may be established on the basis of an entry in the *Suda* that seems to claim he lived in the time of Ptolemy VI Philometer (180–145 BCE) and helped negotiate a treaty with Antiochus for the king (169 BCE).²⁶ This would give us a secure basis for dating both Heraclides and Sotion, if it were not for one inconvenient fact. Diogenes identified the Heraclides Lembos who epitomized the *Successions* as either from Kallatis in Pontos or from Alexandria (D.L. 5.94), whereas the *Suda* claims that the Heraclides Lembos who lived at the time of Ptolemy VI was from Oxyrhynchus. Diogenes gives no date for

²³ Mansfeld (1999) 28 calls it a cento. Cf. Mejer (1978) esp. 16–29, Gigante (1986) 15–34. See Hahm (1992) 4077–82 for summary and further bibliography.

²⁴ The references, most of which come from Diogenes, have been collected by Wehrli (1978). On Diogenes' use of Sotion see Mejer (1978) 40–2.

²⁵ Cf. Wehrli (1978) 7, Runia (2001).

²⁶ Adler, vol. 2, p. 581, para. 462. Cf. Runia (1998).

the author of the *Successions* and the *Suda* gives no titles of the “philosophical and other” books of the contemporary of Ptolemy VI. We either have to assume one or both authors have the wrong place of origin (both allow for Heraclides living later in Alexandria) or else we have to admit the possibility that the *Suda*’s early second-century Egyptian diplomat may have been different from Diogenes’ author of the *Successions*.²⁷

In the final analysis we will have to decide which evidence to discount. When the *Suda* describes Heraclides as a philosopher with the nickname “Lembos,” who wrote “philosophical and other books,” it is hard to deny that he refers to the author of the epitome of Sotion’s *Successions*. Yet the fact that he includes him in a list of several men with the same name increases the possibility that he may have conflated two different people in a single entry.²⁸ On the other hand, place names that are not essential to the logic of the text may be susceptible to accidental or intentional modification. If Heraclides came to be known as “Lembos” and his place of origin forgotten, the place names given by Diogenes and the *Suda* can be explained away as conjectures that he came from the same place as one of the authors he epitomized, viz. Satyrus of Kallatis and later Oxyrhynchus, and Sotion of Alexandria.²⁹

While errors in Heraclides’ place of origin seem more likely than a conflation of two personages in this entry of the *Suda*, the fact that Heraclides’ date depends on this conjecture entails that it is not absolutely secure. Hence Sotion’s date is conjectural as well. The fact is that references to Sotion are almost as hard to fix as references to Aristo. We find Aristos with historical connections to the third, second, and first centuries BCE and Sotions with historical connections to the first century BCE and to the first century CE. In two cases we find a Sotion quoting an Aristo—the case from Diogenes (9.5 = **23**) now under consideration and Simplicius’ report that a Sotion criticized an Aristo for using the term *πρός τι* in both the singular and the plural in the context of interpreting Aristotle’s categories (Simplicius, *In Cat.* 159.23–

²⁷ Diogenes (5.93–4) registers fourteen men named Heraclides, including another Alexandrian.

²⁸ Crönert (1906) 136–7, Philippson (1929) 344–5.

²⁹ So von Kienle (1961) 79–80, who rejects the speculation of Crönert and Philippson (above, n. 28). Mejer (1978) 63, n. 11 concurs.

160.2).³⁰ To review the various possible constructions of individual Aristos and Sotions that have been proposed is unnecessary.³¹ The most we can gain from fixing the date of Sotion is the elimination of one of the later Aristos from consideration as the author of the biographical references; it will not help us decide between Aristo of Chios and Aristo of Ceos, both of whom lived in the third century BCE prior to the earliest possible date of Sotion. In the end, the chronological evidence cannot resolve the question of attribution of the biographical quotations in Diogenes.

To decide between these two we may turn to the most common way of establishing the identity of an unidentified Aristo, that is, to look for similarities to other members of the school. The Peripatetics were well known for their interest in biography and the history of philosophy, whereas there was no similar tendency among Stoics. Thus it may seem reasonable to attribute references with a historical or biographical orientation to Aristo of Ceos.³² However, the subject of two of the alleged biographical allusions, Heraclitus (D.L. 9.5 = **23**, 9.11 = **24A**, cf. 2.22 = **24B**), was of special interest to Stoics; and the subject of the third, Epicurus (D.L. 10.14 = **25**), was the object of the polemics of several Stoics, including Aristo of Chios himself. Information about them, or even extended discussions of Heraclitus and of Epicurus, could well have found a place in writings of the Stoic Aristo. Thus it is understandable that these references have been claimed for Aristo of Chios.³³

If the possibility of a Stoic origin for the biographical reports in Diogenes weakens the case for their attribution to Aristo of Ceos, the textual tradition of Diogenes 10.13–14 = **25** undermines it even more. The manuscripts assign the biographical information on Epicurus to an anonymous, “they say” (οἱ δὲ φασιν); “Ariston” is a conjecture based on the presence of the word ἄριστον immediately preceding the οἱ δὲ.

³⁰ Simplicius no doubt refers to the Peripatetic Aristo of Alexandria, whom he quotes several times on Aristotle’s *Categories* (= fr. 1 Mariotti); cf. Moraux (1973) 1.181–5.

³¹ Sharples (2001) catalogues the primary references to various Sotions other than the author of the *Successions* and speculates on the individuals to whom they refer. On the problem of deciding to which Aristo the various references are to be assigned cf. Mariotti (1966) 37–41, Moraux (1973) 1.181–2.

³² See, e.g., Wehrli (1952) 65, (1968) 580. It continues to be assumed in the literature; cf. Gigante (1996).

³³ Iopollo (1980) 315–21.

The restoration has been widely accepted on the assumption that Aristo of Ceos wrote a history of philosophy. Palaeographically it is far from certain. As André Laks points out, the restoration requires three emendations of the text: reading Ἀρίστων for ἄριστον, the deletion of οἱ, and reading φησι for φασι. Laks opts for a less radical, single emendation of Ἀρίστων for ἄριστον.³⁴ On his reading of the text Diogenes is reporting that an unidentified Aristo began his letters with the salutation “live honorably”: “In the epistles instead of ‘hail’ (χαίρειν), [Epicurus said] ‘Do well’ (εὖ πράττειν), and Ariston, ‘live honorably’ (σπουδαίως ζῆν).” Since Aristo of Chios is known to have published letters (D.L. 7.163), Laks takes this statement as a report about the Stoic Aristo. The subsequent lines about Epicurus’ teachers and his founding of his school, then, must be regarded as derived from an anonymous source (οἱ δέ φασιν). If so, Diogenes offers no evidence for a book on Epicurus by any Aristo.

If Diogenes did not assign to Aristo any biographical report about Epicurus from a book “On Epicurus,” we have only two biographical reports assigned to an unidentified Aristo, both about Heraclitus. Two reports about a philosopher that the Stoics held in high regard as a predecessor of their own philosophy is not much on which to postulate a history of philosophy for Aristo of Ceos, even if he did pass on the wills of the Peripatetics. We have to conclude that while it is not impossible that Aristo of Ceos wrote biographies of earlier philosophers, this claim is at best highly conjectural.

3. The Earliest Witness: Panaetius

Diogenes provides us with one more potential clue to the work of Aristo of Ceos. A few lines before his list of homonyms (7.164 = **1**) and immediately after enumerating the writings of the Stoic Aristo of Chios, Diogenes adds: “Panaetius and Sosicrates say only the epistles are his; the others belong to the Peripatetic Aristo” (7.163 = **8**). This statement seems to allege that Panaetius regarded the titles in the preceding list (with the exception of the epistles) as works of Aristo of Ceos, not the Stoic Aristo. As such, it seems to provide some early evidence regarding the writings of Aristo of Ceos.

³⁴ Laks (1976) 16 (critical text), 75–6 (discussion).

The interpretation of Diogenes' text, however, is not so simple and its relevance to the literary activity of Aristo of Ceos is far from obvious. There are two interrelated problems: (1) the literary/rhetorical context and semantic reference of Diogenes' assertion regarding Panaetius and Sosicrates; and (2) the historical context and the historiographical and philosophical significance of Panaetius' assertion regarding the two Aristos. We may first consider Diogenes' assertion regarding Panaetius. The question we must ask is: When Panaetius originally wrote these words, did he refer to the specific list of titles found today in Diogenes Laertius? Or was his assertion about Aristo of Chios' writings made in a different context? The question is not easily answered. Diogenes Laertius constructed his book by collecting excerpts from various sources and arranging them in a topical order. Many of his sources were composed in the same way.³⁵ If the titles of the Chian's books and Panaetius' assertion about the literary production of the two Aristos constituted a single continuous text (or at least a conceptual unit) that was derived originally from Panaetius, that text may be construed as making the claim that Panaetius reassigned the titles in the preceding bibliography to the Cean.

If, however, the assertion of Panaetius was excerpted from a different text, one in which it was not intended to refer to the specific list of books that now precedes it in Diogenes' text, Panaetius can be credited with the claim that Aristo of Chios wrote everything in the form of letters and consequently any works not in epistolary form circulating under the name of Aristo must have been written by the Peripatetic.³⁶ In that case, Panaetius acknowledged the existence of writings by Aristo of Ceos, but gives us no evidence for specific titles. Strictly speaking, he gives us no information about titles of the Chian's works either; he says only that they were epistolary in form.

³⁵ On the method of composition by excerpting see above n. 23.

³⁶ So Alesse (1997) 291–4, following a suggestion of von Arnim, *SVF* 1 p. 75–6 n. on fr. 333 line 27. Accordingly Alesse does not include the list of titles in her testimonium of Panaetius T 151. Von Arnim apparently regarded all the titles in the list as referable to Aristo of Chios, though he thought some (viz. the lectures, diatribes, notes, memorabilia, and anecdotes) were probably written down by students on the basis of oral presentations. Previously von Arnim (1900) 12–13 had construed Panaetius' remark as referring to the preceding bibliography and indicating that the non-epistolary works were either by Aristo of Ceos or records of the Chian's oral presentations by his students.

One does not even have to assume that Panaetius' statement was made independently of the preceding list to construe it as a claim about the rhetorical form of Aristo of Chios' writings. One can interpret Panaetius as saying that the very writings that in the text are attributed to Aristo of Chios were in the form of letters, letters containing the types of discourse identified in Diogenes, i.e., exhortations, dialogues, lectures, diatribes, notes, memorabilia, anecdotes, and polemics against other philosophers. In that case, we can learn something more about the writings of Aristo of Chios, but still nothing more about Aristo of Ceos beyond the bare fact that he wrote books that were not in epistolary form.

There is only one way that we may be able to use Diogenes' text for more than the bare fact that Panaetius believed in the existence of writings circulating under the name of Aristo of Ceos. That is to establish (1) that Panaetius was the source of both a bibliography of Aristo of Chios and of the subsequent remark, and (2) that his subsequent remark refers to the specific titles that he registers as works of Aristo of Chios and in so doing passes judgment on their authorship.³⁷

To make the case for that supposition, we have to consider the second problem, the historical context of Panaetius' ostensible judgment and his possible motivation for making it. Here our pursuit becomes even more speculative. We know that Panaetius passed judgment on the authorship of books by a number of philosophers in the Socratic tradition. He accepted the dialogues of Plato (with one exception), Xenophon, Antisthenes, and Aeschines, as authentic and trustworthy (ἀληθεῖς). But he had doubts about the authenticity of the dialogues of Phaedo and Euclides and he categorically rejected all the rest (D.L. 2.64 = T 145 Alesse; cf. also D.L. 2.105, 108). He was concerned with both the authorship and the trustworthiness of the content, and he questioned the authorship of works whose content did not in his judgment give an accurate portrayal of Socrates' life.³⁸ He showed no evidence of interest in the literary form. He may also have evaluated the bibliography of

³⁷ This is assumed without argument by, e.g., Wehrli (1951) 50–1 on fr. 9, (1968) 157, (1983) 579, Fortenbaugh (1997) 55–6. We do not need to prove that Diogenes (or his source) excerpted the bibliography and Panaetius' judgment from Panaetius himself, only that Panaetius referred to a specific list of titles identical with or similar to the one surviving in Diogenes Laertius. We must remember that for some authors non-identical lists of writings were circulating simultaneously, as Diogenes attests for Aristippus (2.83–5).

³⁸ Alesse (1997) 280–7.

Aristippus; at least he accepted a shorter and different list of writings (2.85) than the list that Diogenes knew and cited from some other source (2.83-4 = T 150 Alesse). He denied that Plato wrote one of the dialogues attributed to him, namely, the *Phaedo*, because it contains what he as a Stoic regarded as an incorrect view of the soul (Asclepius, *In Metaph.* 991b3 = T 146 Alesse; cf. *Anth. Pal.* 9.358 = T 147). Panaetius' propensity to pass judgment on the historical reliability, philosophical correctness, and authenticity or authorship of works in the Socratic tradition, combined with the widespread practice of such activity at and before Panaetius' time, makes it hard to imagine that his comments on the Stoic Aristo's writing did not include a judgment on the authorship or authenticity of particular books, namely the books enumerated in Diogenes' list.

If Panaetius did challenge the authorship of the titles attributed to Aristo of Chios and attempted to reassign them to Aristo of Ceos, we have to inquire into his motivation. We cannot assign to him modern motivations and simply assume that he spoke with the voice of scholarly opinion or as an objective literary critic and historian, seeking to discover the true author of these works. He was, after all, a committed Stoic; and in challenging the authorship of these titles he was giving up a claim to these works as Stoic teaching and assigning them and their contents to the Peripatos. In so doing, he aligned himself with a point of view shared by others in the Stoic community.

In the second century BCE, the Stoics were undergoing an identity crisis, in which many Stoics found themselves embarrassed by some of the Cynic overtones of their third-century predecessors. They valued Zeno's Cynic origin because it gave them a Socratic pedigree, passing through Antisthenes, Diogenes of Sinope, and Crates of Thebes to Zeno.³⁹ But many Stoics were embarrassed by Cynic shamelessness, the unconventional and socially offensive behavior advocated by some Cynics and found in writings of several third-century Stoics. To distance themselves from these offensive elements, Stoics of the second

³⁹ Goulet-Cazé (1992) 3909–41, esp. 3927–33, 3941–51, traces this succession back to Sotion's *Successions* in the second century BCE and ultimately to the Stoic Apollodorus of Seleucia, who wrote an *Introduction to the Doctrines*. Apollodorus acknowledged the Cynic aspects of Stoicism and emphasized the common ground between the two schools.

and first centuries BCE adopted several different strategies.⁴⁰ One strategy was to detach Zeno from Cynicism completely and claim a Socratic heritage through Stilpo of Megara (D.L. 2.114, 120), since Stilpo was a student either of another Socratic, Euclides of Megara, or of his followers (D.L. 2.113, cf. 110). In fact, in this Socratic succession, Crates is claimed to have followed the same course as Zeno (D.L. 2.113-14). Diogenes the Cynic is thereby rendered irrelevant to Stoic origins.⁴¹

A second strategy was to retain the Cynic link to Socrates via Antisthenes, Diogenes, and Crates, but to purge both Cynicism and third-century Stoicism of its offensive elements by denying the authenticity of works that contained offensive teaching and by formulating Cynic teaching in such a way as to reduce the role of unconventional behavior and to stress Cynicism's common ground with the teachings and mores of second-century Stoics.⁴² This strategy was already reflected in Sotion, who had rejected some of the writings of Diogenes the Cynic (D.L. 6.80).⁴³ Diogenes Laertius' presentation of the books of Zeno suggests someone had rejected some of Zeno's writings too, presumably for their offensive Cynic elements.⁴⁴ In the first century, Athenodorus Cordylion of Tarsus literally cut the offensive passages out of the copies of Zeno's books in the Pergamene library. When his action was discovered, he was forced to restore the mutilated texts (D.L. 7.34).

Aristo of Chios, too, came in for criticism from the same quarter.⁴⁵ He had insisted on the absolute indifference of everything except virtue and vice (D.L. 7.37, 160). His line of reasoning, though seemingly developed out of Zeno's conception of the goal of life, effectively contravened Zeno's contention that among things indifferent some were by nature preferable, giving people a natural basis for appropriate behav-

⁴⁰ Mansfeld (1986) 317-51, Hahm (1992) 4090-1. For the effect of these activities on the historiographical tradition and on Diogenes' *Life of Zeno* see Hahm (2002).

⁴¹ This strategy is reflected in Heracleides Lembos, who published an abridgement of Sotion's *Successions* of philosopher (D.L. 2.120). Hippobatus was another who challenged the Cynic succession by denying that Crates was a student of Diogenes (D.L. 6.85). Cf. Mansfeld (1986) 314-15, 322, 325-6, Goulet-Cazé (1992) 3924-6.

⁴² Cf. Mansfeld (1986) 321-2, 346, 351.

⁴³ See above, n. 39. Sotion was followed by Sosicrates (D.L. 6.80 = fr. 11 Andria).

⁴⁴ Cf. Hahm (1992) 4254-5.

⁴⁵ On Aristo's philosophy and relation to other Stoics see Ioppolo (1980).

ior across a wide range of human activities (D.L. 7.104–10). Chrysippus attacked Aristo vigorously and with lasting effect.⁴⁶ In the second century, Carneades expressly excluded Aristo's position from his division of ethical philosophies, on the grounds that it admits no basis in nature for ethical choice (e.g., *Fin.* 4.43, 5.23, *Off.* 1.6), and because it was allegedly no longer defended by anyone (*Acad.* 2.130, *Fin.* 2.35, 2.43, 5.23, *Off.* 1.6).⁴⁷ Aristo's commitment to indifference, moreover, brought him close to the position of the Cynics, a point that was underlined in Diogenes' summary of Cynic principles (D.L. 6.103–5). Diogenes Laertius' source classified him as one of the three Stoics who "differed" (διηνέχθησαν) from mainstream Stoicism (7.160, 167) and who were to be segregated from the orthodox doxography (7.160–7).⁴⁸ By the second-century BCE, he was more vulnerable than Zeno to the criticism of those who wished to purge Stoicism of its Cynic elements.

A combination of the two strategies for coping with the Cynic element of Stoicism was also developed about the same time. In the best known version, adopted by Diogenes Laertius, Zeno began to study philosophy as a student of the Cynic Crates, and for a time in his youth was committed to Cynicism. But when he came to recognize the moral inadequacy of Cynic shamelessness, he left Crates for Stilpo and other teachers.⁴⁹ Eventually he discovered the truth about the virtuous life and with that discovery created a superior new philosophy of his own, later to be known as Stoicism. In this scenario, Zeno's student Aristo of Chios failed to mature to the level achieved by Zeno and instead remained fixated on an essentially Cynic plane. Aristo's philosophical position could then be viewed as an aberrant, imperfectly developed version of Stoicism, in contrast to the philosophy of the mature Zeno

⁴⁶ Ioppolo (1980) esp. 37–8, 166–70.

⁴⁷ Cf. Lévy (1980), (1992) 358, 363–72. On Carneades' division see Lévy (1992) 337–76, Algra (1997) 120–30. Carneades' division of ethical theories is presented most completely in Cicero, *Fin.* 5.16–23, where it is attributed to Carneades and Antiochus of Ascalon (cf. *Fin.* 5.16). Since Carneades wrote nothing, his division must have been passed on orally and derived by Cicero either from Carneades' student Clitomachus, who wrote about Carneades, or from Antiochus, who used the division for his own purposes, or from both; cf. Algra 127–8.

⁴⁸ Cf. Hahm (1992) 4155–62, esp. 4155–8.

⁴⁹ This version was promulgated in the first century by Apollonius of Tyre (D.L. 7.2, 24) and before him in the late second century by Hecaton (D.L. 7.2): cf. Hahm (1992) 4088–97, (2002) 41–3.

and his authentic successors, Cleanthes and Chrysippus. This view dominates the sources Diogenes used to construct his own account of the history of the Stoa in Book 7.

Panaetius' disavowal of the writings of the Stoic Aristo, in my view, fits best into the second strategy, affirming the Socratic-Cynic-Stoic linkage by purging Cynic and Stoic authors of offensive texts.⁵⁰ Panaetius was presumably the source of Cicero's criticism of shameless Cynicizing Stoics in *De officiis* (Cic. *Off.* 1.128, 1.148 = T 73 Alesse; cf. 1.99, 126–9).⁵¹ He was certainly a strong defender of the natural basis for human behavior and wrote *On Appropriate Action* in three books to defend it.⁵² It would be understandable for him to deem Aristo's writings unacceptable with their promotion of a life of absolute indifference and their Cynic resonances. Reassignment of the major works of the Stoic Aristo to the Peripatetic of the same name would achieve his Stoic polemical objectives without jeopardizing the Cynic-Stoic linkage to Socrates.⁵³

If Panaetius' reassignment of the list of titles in D.L. 7.163 = 8 to Aristo of Ceos was motivated by his defense of appropriate actions grounded in nature and by his antipathy toward Cynic elements within

⁵⁰ Alesse (1997) 206–11, maintaining that Panaetius probably never questioned Aristo of Chios' authorship of the books attributed to him (291–4), makes Panaetius an adherent of the combination strategy, excusing Zeno's cynicizing *Republic* as a juvenile error. She does so on the grounds that the only known instance of athetizing Stoic works was Athenodorus' partial attempt to remove the cynicizing passages from Zeno's *Republic* and he was punished for the attempt. If, however, her interpretation of Panaetius' remark about Aristo's books is wrong, Athenodorus' athetization will not be unique. Moreover, I think an argument can be made that Zeno's bibliography in Diogenes Laertius contains a hint that it was compiled to affirm Zenonian authorship of a number of books that had at some time been rejected; cf. Hahm (1992) 4154–5.

⁵¹ Cf. Pohlenz (1948) 2.84 on 1.155 line 19, Alesse (1997) 206–12, though Alesse does not connect his criticism of Cynicizing Stoics with a rejection of the works of Aristo of Chios; see above p. 192 and n. 36.

⁵² This became the basis for Cicero's *De officiis*.

⁵³ Sosicrates, who followed Panaetius in assigning Aristo's books to the Peripatetic (D.L. 7.163), is attested to have rejected the authenticity also of the writings of the Cynic Diogenes of Sinope. Panaetius may well have done the same. If so, he might be among the Stoics that Philodemus claimed rejected Diogenes' books (*De Stoicis* 6, col. 15); cf. Dorandi (1982) 119–20 for discussion of Philodemus' reference. Sosicrates also denied that Aristippus wrote the dialogues attributed to him (D.L. 2.84 = fr. 10 Andria). Aristippus was perceived as taking positions that the Stoics found as offensive as those of the Cynics; cf. Andria (1989) 100–3.

his own school, his reassignment carries no weight. In that case, Ioppolo's demonstration of the compatibility of the titles with the Stoic Aristo's philosophy is a more than sufficient argument for the Chian's authorship, regardless of whether some of the titles are compatible with Peripatetic interests or with subjects and titles attested for the Cean.⁵⁴

There is more. Even if we leave Panaetius' hypothetical motivation out of the picture, we cannot infer from Diogenes' report of Panaetius' allegation that the books listed in D.L 7.163 = **8** were regarded as of disputed authorship in the second century BCE, and that each individual title is consequently in the same position as the ancient references to an unspecified Aristo, namely, assignable to one or the other Aristo only on the basis of compatibility with other evidence for the author or with the interests of the school.⁵⁵ We still have to recognize that Diogenes found the list handed down as a bibliography of Aristo of Chios contained within a biography of Aristo of Chios. The list left no trace on the ancient tradition of the Peripatetic Aristo of Ceos. Even Panaetius, if he did make his comment regarding the books listed in **8**, knew this list as a list of books by the Stoic. He was, in fact, challenging the established attribution of the second century BCE. Sosicrates, who was presumably an intermediary for the information, then recorded Panaetius' challenge to the established view. Thus, the burden of proof has to be on Panaetius and those who would follow him in transferring the books to the Peripatetic Aristo.

Moreover, it is the entire list that is in question, not the individual titles. Neither Panaetius nor Diogenes viewed the list as a conflation of titles of two different authors.⁵⁶ The alternative that Panaetius invited

⁵⁴ Ioppolo (1980) 39–53. It should be noted that Panaetius denied that Plato wrote the *Phaedo* because it contradicted his belief that the soul was mortal (T 146 Alesse).

⁵⁵ As alleged by, e.g., Wehrli (1952) 50–1, (1968) 157, (1983) 579, Fortenbaugh (1997) 55–6. Wehrli (1983) allows that as many as nine of the 15 titles in Diogenes were possibly or probably by the Peripatetic. Fortenbaugh accepts at least two as plausibly attributable to the Cean.

⁵⁶ Wehrli (1968) 157 attempts to justify treating each title independently by suggesting that the list could have come from an ancient library in which titles of various Aristos were shelved together because of the similarity of the names (not only identical given names, but also places of origin similar in sound and spelling: KEIOΣ, XIOΣ). Alesse (1997) 293–4 concurs, but only as another possibility besides the hypothesis of von Arnim; see above n. 36. Alfonsi's (1957) 367 allegation that the names were confused in late antiquity (cited in confirmation by Alesse) is unproven and irrelevant to the state of understanding in the second century BCE.

his readers to adopt is that Aristo the Stoic wrote nothing at all for publication, or at least no titled works, only some letters. Certainly that was Diogenes' understanding of Panaetius' assertion, for on its basis, he asserts that some classify Aristo with Socrates, Stilpo, Carneades, and a few other philosophers who wrote nothing (1.16) and presumably engaged others only in oral dialectic.

It would be convenient if we could refute Panaetius simply by pointing to a quotation of Aristo of Chios from one of these very titles, but the only unimpeachable quotation of him comes from a book entitled *Comparisons* (ὁμοιώματα, Stob. 3.4.109 = SVF 1.350), which is not found in Diogenes' list.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, there are so many explicit summaries of Aristo of Chios' beliefs and sayings (some extensive) in Cicero, Seneca, Sextus, Plutarch, and Eusebius, that it is impossible to believe he did not write for publication. Panaetius' denial of the Stoic Aristo's authorship of the works attributed to him can be regarded as a counsel of desperation, lacking even a modicum of credibility.

What we can take away from Diogenes' report about Panaetius is this: (1) the works in the bibliography of Aristo of Chios were well known to be his; (2) neither Panaetius nor anyone else at the time was confused about the identity and philosophical provenience of the two Aristos; (3) if Panaetius did challenge the Stoic's authorship of these works, his challenge failed and the ascription to the Chian prevailed, with Panaetius' attempt becoming only a footnote to history; and (4) Panaetius can tell us nothing about Aristo of Ceos that we do not have on better authority, though he may reveal something about the history of the Stoa.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ Plutarch (*Demosth.* 10, 30) says he used Aristo of Chios as a source for information on Demosthenes and Demades. Since Aristo of Chios wrote a work entitled *Against the Orators* (D.L. 7.163), it is tempting to conjecture that this was the book that Plutarch used. That, however, is only a conjecture.

⁵⁸ Even if Panaetius' statement was originally independent of the list of Aristo of Chios' books and merely acknowledged the existence of (unspecified) titles circulating under the name of Aristo (cf. above p. 192), he tells us no more than does Cicero, who tells us that Aristo of Ceos wrote many books (*Fin.* 5.13; see below p. 201).

4. First-Century Memories: Cicero and Strabo

From Diogenes' report of Panaetius we may turn to Cicero, the earliest extant author who knows and talks about Aristo of Ceos.⁵⁹ He also knew Aristo of Chios and referred to him frequently. Cicero's chief interest in Aristo of Chios lay in his signature teaching that virtue is the only good and everything else is absolutely indifferent, a position that Cicero strongly rejects.⁶⁰ In opposition to his teacher Zeno, Aristo refused to acknowledge that some things, while morally indifferent, are preferable, i.e., primary natural things, like life and health. In citing Aristo of Chios, Cicero sometimes refers to him by his place of origin as "the Chian" (e.g. *ND* 3.77, *Acad.* 2.123, *Tusc.* 5.27, *Leg.* 1.55), or by his philosophical affiliation as "the student of Zeno" (*Acad.* 2.130, *ND* 1.37). He does not always do so; yet even when he does not, there was never any question to whom he is referring. His 14 references in *De finibus* to Aristo with no place of origin are never in doubt: all refer to the Chian's signature doctrine, and many link him with Pyrrho (*Fin.* 2.43, 3.11, 3.12, 4.49, 4.60) or with Pyrrho and Herillus (*Fin.* 2.35, 5.23; cf. *Tusc.* 5.85, *Off.* 1.6) as proponents of the same error. When Cicero does not condemn Aristo's ethical beliefs, he condemns Aristo's agnosticism regarding physics and theology, once with a place of origin (*Acad.* 2.123) and once without (*ND* 1.37).

What is noteworthy about Cicero's reports about Aristo of Chios is that they record only a handful of doxographical propositions. The only reference that is not elementary doxography is an apophthegm, another feature characteristic of the biographical tradition; and when Cicero quotes this, he is careful to identify its author as Aristo of Chios from Zeno's school (*ND* 3.77 = *SVF* 3.348). There is no evidence that Cicero knew any of Aristo's writings first-hand. His knowledge was, to all appearances, second-hand, and his attitude toward Aristo of Chios is dismissive or hostile.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Though Philodemus might not qualify as an extant author in the sense of an author whose works have been transmitted through the ages in manuscript form, he does record an extract from an unspecified Aristo, *On Relieving Arrogance* (20–1). If this was Aristo of Ceos, as is commonly believed, Philodemus would be another first century witness, contemporary with Cicero. The problem of identifying this Aristo is discussed by Dorandi in this volume.

⁶⁰ On Cicero's treatment of Aristo see Lévy (1980), (1992) 364–72.

⁶¹ This is true when he writes from a Stoic perspective (e.g., *Fin.* 3.11, 12, 50, 64), as well as when he expresses an anti-Stoic perspective (*Fin.* 4.43, 47, 68–9, 78).

What Cicero knew of Aristo of Ceos plays a much smaller role in his philosophical work, but he clearly knew something concrete about him. He knew more, in fact, than Diogenes Laertius. In *De finibus* 5, Cicero gives a brief survey of the history of the Peripatos with special reference to its contributions to ethics. A speech put into the mouth of Piso, an avowed proponent of Peripatetic philosophy, presents views that Cicero himself regarded as consistent with the ethical philosophy of Antiochus of Ascalon (cf. *Fin.* 5.7–8), a first century Academic who claimed there were no differences among the ethical philosophies of Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics.⁶² Piso prefaces his account of this ethical theory with a brief history of the Peripatos, following the succession of Peripatetic scholars and adding summaries or evaluations of the style and literary output of many. When he comes to Aristo, he says he was refined and elegant, but lacked the seriousness (*gravitas*) that was desirable in a great philosopher. His writings, he adds, were voluminous (*multa*) and polished (*polita*), but “his style is somehow lacking in authority [*aucloritatem*]” (*Fin.* 5.13 = **9**). This information is securely attributed to Aristo of Ceos in that it is situated in a Peripatetic succession. Like Cicero’s knowledge of the Stoic Aristo, it comes from a handbook tradition, not from any direct knowledge of Aristo’s writings. Nevertheless, the source was clearly knowledgeable about the writings of the Peripatetics, as its summary of the writings of Aristotle and Theophrastus shows (*Fin.* 5.9–12). Moreover, Cicero displays no hostility to the Peripatetic Aristo, whereas he does to Aristo of Chios. Thus, we may feel confident in using Cicero’s witness, not only to confirm Aristo’s position as Lyco’s successor, but also to infer that Aristo of Ceos was a prolific author of well-crafted works. This is the earliest indubitable testimony to Aristo’s literary activity.

Cicero offers one more witness to an Aristo. In his *Cato*, he remarks that he will not assign the discussion of old age in this dialogue to Tithonus, as Aristo did, but rather to the elder Cato. He explains that a discussion in a mythological story would have less authority than a discussion in the mouth of Cato (*Cato* 3 = **18**). Cicero, as we have seen, knew the difference between the Chian and the Cean and cared enough never to leave the identity of his references in doubt. Here he is careful to specify Aristo’s city of origin. Unfortunately, the medieval copyists were not as careful, and today the manuscript tradition is divided

⁶² Cf. Barnes (1989) 86–9.

over whether Cicero originally wrote *Chius* or *Ceus*. The reading *Chius* is found in the older manuscript and can be traced back to one early exemplar, but the corrupt reading *Aristoleus* can be traced back equally far and looks like a corruption of *Aristo Ceus*. If it is, the two readings are equally ancient. Jonathan Powell, the most recent editor, finds no paleographic grounds for preferring one to the other.⁶³

Thus, we find ourselves in the ironic situation that even an author who did his best to avoid ambiguous references to Aristo has ended up with one nevertheless. The best we can now hope for is to fix the reference by the traditional comparative method. Here there is some chance for success. The criticism of this Aristo expressed in the *Cato* is similar to the one expressed in the sketch of Aristo of Ceos in *De finibus*. The theme (a practical discussion of old age), too, seems more appropriate for a Peripatetic than for the Stoic Aristo, who made so much of the absolute indifference of anything but virtue. All in all, the comparative evidence seems to weigh slightly in favor of the Cean.⁶⁴ Moreover, the fact that Cicero held no hostile attitude toward the Cean's philosophical ideas, as he did toward the Chian's, comports well with his choice of the Cean as a foil for his own work. If Cicero did indeed refer to Aristo of Ceos in the *Cato*, we can take from him not only a general impression of the Peripatetic Aristo as a prolific writer, but perhaps also the specific information that he wrote a work in which he placed a discussion of old age in the mouth of a mythological character, viz. Tithonus.

Cicero gives us a glimpse of what educated non-philosophers knew about Aristo in the middle of the first century BCE. They knew there were two Aristos and they knew their relationship to their respective schools. They knew the Stoic as a dissident student of the founder Zeno and the Peripatetic as a leader in the official succession of scholars. They seem also to have known something of their writings and something of the Stoic's dissident teaching, since this was the distinguishing feature of his identity in the historiographical and doxographical tradition. They probably also had the kind of information that later would form the basis of Diogenes' *Lives*, but some would have had more than Diogenes did, namely a fuller version of the Peripatetic succession.

⁶³ Powell (1988) 101–2.

⁶⁴ See Powell (1988) 269–72, and the summary of the controversy above, p. 180–1.

Strabo gives us another glimpse of what was known about Aristo later in the century. As an historian and geographer, Strabo reflects a different interest from Cicero's, yet one that includes elements of the history of philosophy. In an introductory critique of Eratosthenes of Cyrene, one of his predecessors in geography, Strabo quotes his observation that "there was at that time a gathering of philosophers flourishing around Aristo and Arcesilaus such as never before within a single wall or a single city" (1.2.2). Strabo, who regarded himself as a Stoic (1.2.43, 16.4.27, cf. 1.2.3, 2.3.8), takes Eratosthenes to be referring here to the Stoic Aristo (*SVF* 1.338), whom Strabo appears to know only as a dissident student of Zeno's who left no enduring school. We can infer this from the fact that Strabo uses Eratosthenes' characterization of Aristo and Arcesilaus as "chief [κορυφαίους] of the philosophers who flourished at that time," along with his citations of Apelles and Bion, as evidence of Eratosthenes' poor judgment and unreliability, arguing that Eratosthenes, despite studying under Zeno, never mentions any of Zeno's successors except those "who differed from him and whose school [διαδοχή] has not survived" (1.2.2). Strabo thereby signals his dependence on the same handbook tradition that Cicero followed, the tradition that characterized Aristo as a dissident Stoic whose philosophy no longer finds defenders. Not surprisingly, Strabo does not register Aristo among the famous citizens of Chios (14.1.35).

Of the Peripatetic Aristo Strabo knew something too, but not much. In his description of Ceos, he enumerates among its famous citizens "Aristo the Peripatetic and emulator [ζηλωτής] of Bion of Borysthene" (10.5.6 = **2A**). Strabo apparently not only knew of Aristo of Ceos, but also knew something about his philosophical orientation as a Peripatetic with sympathy for the unconventional sophist Bion. Moreover, he was aware that by the first century BCE, there were at least two more Peripatetic Aristos. In his list of the famous citizens of Cos, after enumerating some names from the past (from Hippocrates to Philetas), he concludes, "And in our time [καθ' ἡμῶς] Aristo who heard the Peripatetic and was his heir" (14.2.19 = **31**). The identity of this second Peripatetic Aristo is far from certain; but Strabo's identification of him as "the student and heir of the Peripatetic" (without a proper name attached) has sometimes been taken to mean that he was a student and heir of Aristo of Ceos.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ E.g. by Gercke (1896), Wehrli (1952), who prints the text as fr. 8, and Sharples (2002b) 1120. They do so without any explicit argumentation. Wehrli's (1952) 50,

If this is correct, we can infer that Strabo also knew something of Aristo's students and successors and hence a bit more about the life of Aristo of Ceos and the history of the Peripatos. This identification, however, cannot be correct. Even if Strabo used "in our time" loosely for his entire life span (as Fraser has argued), no student of a Peripatetic scholarch prior to Critolaus could have survived to Strabo's lifetime.⁶⁶ The Coan must have been a student and heir of another, later Peripatetic.

The identity of the teacher of Aristo of Cos will depend on how one interprets Strabo's enigmatic allusion to "the Peripatetic" without a proper name. If it is taken as a self-contained statement, it might conceivably be construed as referring to a Peripatetic whose name is not mentioned because it is the same as that of the subject of the statement, viz. Aristo.⁶⁷ If so, and if chronology precludes the third-century scholarch, the Peripatetic teacher and predecessor of Aristo of Cos must be a third Peripatetic Aristo. Then one possibility is Aristo of Alexandria, who was known to Cicero (*Acad.* 2.12 = T2 Mariotti) and registered in Diogenes' list of homonyms of Aristo of Chios (D.L. 7.164 = T4 Mariotti). Strabo also knew of a third Peripatetic Aristo, another contemporary of his like Aristo of Cos. In his account of the Nile, Strabo tells us that in his time (καθ' ἡμᾶς) Eudorus and Aristo "from the Peripatetics" wrote about the Nile (17.1.5). He accuses one of copying from the other, and, though unsure who copied from whom, he pronounces the style more Aristonean, indicating that he had actually read the work on the Nile. This Aristo may well be the same as Aristo of

53, (1959) 83, justification of his interpretation of Strabo's text as referring to a student of Aristo of Ceos consists of arguments against identifying the subject, Aristo of Cos, with other known Aristos. He does not seem to have reflected on why one should assume that someone identified simply as "the Peripatetic" must have had the name "Aristo."

⁶⁶ Since Critolaus was scholarch in 155 BCE, a student who was old enough to have heard his predecessor would have to have been born before 175 and could not have been alive in the 60's when Strabo was born. Fraser (1972) 2.708 n. 96 discusses Strabo's use of the expression καθ' ἡμᾶς; cf. also Mariotti (1966) 40. The fragments of Critolaus and his students Diodorus and Aristo the Younger have been collected by Wehrli (1959).

⁶⁷ It would be interesting to know what unconscious assumptions lie behind Gercke's and Wehrli's reading of "the Peripatetic" as a reference to Aristo of Ceos. They may have been encouraged by the assumption that Strabo was referring to a Peripatetic he had already introduced, viz. Aristo of Ceos, among the famous men of his city a few books earlier (10.5.6).

Alexandria, known to Cicero and Diogenes Laertius.⁶⁸ Otherwise, he makes an equally suitable candidate for the teacher of Aristo of Cos.

Such conjectures regarding the teacher of Aristo of Cos are plausible if and only if Strabo's unnamed "Peripatetic" is assumed to be unnamed because his name is the same as that of the Aristo that was Strabo's subject. If, however, the entry about Aristo in Strabo's list of famous Coans was excerpted from an entirely different context, one in which the predecessor was precisely identified, such as a succession of Peripatetic leaders, it can reasonably be taken to refer to Critolaus, who is known to have had a student named Aristo, whose provenance has not been preserved (Quintilian *Inst.* 2.15.19; Sextus *Adv. Math.* 2.61 = Aristo the Younger, frs. 1–2 W).⁶⁹ In any case, Strabo's reference to the Coan is irrelevant for Strabo's knowledge of Aristo of Ceos. It is nevertheless still of importance for our own quest for Aristo of Ceos. It proves that by Strabo's time there were at least two more Peripatetic Aristos besides him on the philosophical scene: Aristo of Cos, and another Aristo, who wrote a book on the Nile and may have been from Alexandria. From now on, any attempt to identify unspecified Aristos will have to consider more possibilities than only the Cean and the Chian.

5. Through the Centuries: Plutarch, Athenaeus, and Stobaeus

In the late first century CE, Plutarch takes over as our witness for knowledge of Aristo. Like every previous author who alluded to Aristo of Ceos, Plutarch knew of both Aristo of Ceos and Aristo of Chios. Aristo of Ceos he knew in the same way that Cicero did: as a member of the Peripatetic succession. He rehearses Peripatetic and Stoic successions as examples of wise men who left home, not in pursuit of fame

⁶⁸ Cf. Mariotti (1966), who prints Strabo 17.1.5 as a testimonium of Aristo of Alexandria (T7).

⁶⁹ Von Arnim (1900) 13. Gercke (1896) also suggested this possibility, even though he assumed Strabo's reference to an anonymous Peripatetic teacher applied to Aristo of Ceos. Wehrli (1952) 50, 53, (1959) 83, who shared that assumption, entertains the possibility that Aristo of Cos was a student of both Aristo of Ceos and Critolaus. This, he admits, is hypothetically possible, if Critolaus was not much younger than Aristo of Ceos; but he thinks it less probable than the hypothesis that Strabo's student of "the Peripatetic" and the Coan student of Critolaos (mentioned in Quintilian and Sextus) were two different people. Wehrli is followed by Mariotti (1966) 76 n. 5, and Sharples (2002c) 1120.

and honors, but in pursuit of peace (ἡσυχία), which was not available to citizens in their own city because of the cares and distractions of business and politics (*Exil.* 605A–C = **3**).⁷⁰ Because he sought examples of intelligent men who intentionally and voluntarily left their native land, philosophers in Athens were an ideal choice, since few Athenians after Socrates and Plato devoted their lives to philosophy. Plutarch follows a handbook list of successions that included both Peripatetics and Stoics, but he also records each philosopher's place of origin, since his aim is to present them as away from their city of birth.⁷¹ He thereby becomes the only source to cite the members of the Peripatetic succession with birthplace.

Obviously, Plutarch was familiar with Aristo of Ceos as head of the Peripatos, but he also knew him as a writer. In his biography of Aristides, he cites Aristo of Ceos explicitly by place of origin as his authority for the theory that the hostility between Aristides and Themistocles first began when they became rival lovers of the same youth, Stesilaos of Ceos (*Aristides* 2.2–3 = **14A**). He repeats the story in his *Life of Themistocles*, citing his source as “Aristo the philosopher” (*Them.* 3.1–2 = **14A**). That would indicate that Plutarch also knew Aristo of Ceos as a writer either of historical matters or (more likely) of examples of lovers.⁷²

That Plutarch also knew of Aristo of Chios is attested by several references. In his essay “On the Theme That a Philosopher Ought to Converse Especially with Men in Power,” he quotes the response of Aristo of Chios to sophists who had criticized him for talking to everyone indiscriminately: “Would that even wild animals understood words that motivate virtue” (*Max. princ.* 776C = *SVF* 1.382). Like many ancient

⁷⁰ Parts of this passage form Aristo of Ceus fr. 3 Wehrli and Archedemus fr. 2 *SVF* 3.

⁷¹ We should note that Plutarch does not expressly call his list of Peripatetic and Stoic philosophers a list of successive heads of the two school (διαδοχοί), but he does use the word διαδοχή in connection with one of the Stoics. His list of Stoics includes Archedemus, whom he identifies as an Athenian but claims as an example for his thesis because he moved to Babylon and started a Stoic succession (διαδοχήν) there. His mention of that succession suggests that the ultimate source of his report was a catalogue of heads of the schools and their students, such as we find in Philodemus' histories of the Academy and the Stoa. On the question of the relationship of this Archedemus to Archedemus of Tarsus, see Ferrary (1988) 464.

⁷² The latter is more likely because Aristo of Ceos is known to have written a book on “Erotic Examples” (**10–14, 22**). See below p. 209.

authors, he knew Aristo of Chios as the author of the well-turned apophthegm. The genre was often a component of biographies, and collections of a philosopher's apophthegms were common. In Diogenes' bibliography of Aristo of Chios, we find mention of such a collection of Aristo's sayings (*Chreai*) and learn that it ran to twenty-one books. But Plutarch cites only one apophthegm. That raises the question whether he was familiar with the full collection, or had seen only a few in a biography. After all, even Diogenes' brief and hostile biography contains a few.

It is certain that Plutarch knew more about Aristo of Chios as a writer than a few apophthegms transmitted in a biography. In *On Moral Virtue*, he offers an objective summary of the Chian's conception of virtue (440F = SVF 1.375). In his *Life of Demosthenes*, he cites Aristo of Chios for the way Demosthenes committed suicide and for the evaluations of Demosthenes and Demades that were expressed by Theophrastus (*Demosth.* 10, 30 = SVF 1.380–1). These indicate that Plutarch had a fairly detailed knowledge of Aristo of Chios. His knowledge of Aristo's ethical philosophy was more detailed than Diogenes' knowledge. He also knew something of Aristo's views of orators, which was the subject of a volume in Diogenes' bibliography: *Against the Orators* (7.163 = 8). All of this indicates a broader familiarity with the Chian's works than we find in any of the earlier authors, and it suggests that the Chian's work was with time becoming better known, not less.

With this background, we can turn to Plutarch's references to an unspecified Aristo. We should first note that Plutarch knew still other Aristos: the ancient king of Sparta (*Apophth. Lac.* 218A), the author of a historical work entitled "The Colonization of Athens" (*De Iside* 365E), and a mercenary leader (*De sera num.* 553D–E), though he shows no knowledge of any other philosophers named "Aristo." Since he knew so many Aristos and was aware that "Aristo" was a common name, we might have expected him to take care to identify these Aristos when he refers to them. But he often refers to an Aristo with no identifier at all. Sometimes this does not matter, as, for example, when he uses the name for a character in a dialogue (*QC* 1.1 612F), or for a relative of a character (*De soll.* 965B–C). But eight times Plutarch quotes an unspecified Aristo, and once he cites the title of a work by an unspecified Aristo.

The latter is intriguing because he reports that the title of the work was *Lyco*, which is the name of the head of the Peripatos when Aristo

was a student and associate. We have seen from Lyco's will (5) and a later story in Themistius (6) that Aristo had been close to Lyco, and we know that it was not uncommon for philosophers to write about their teachers.⁷³ Moreover, Plutarch cites this work as an example of philosophical works that give the impression of not being philosophical or serious, and thus appeal to the young. That characterization fits comfortably with Cicero's handbook characterization of Aristo of Ceos' works as well-wrought, but lacking in authority.⁷⁴ To these arguments we may now add that our examination of Plutarch's knowledge of the Cean and his practice of quoting him, though it does not confirm a reference to the Cean Aristo, does not militate against it either. We may infer that Plutarch had more than handbook knowledge of Aristo of Ceos and could well have referred to, and known, some of his writings.

That leaves Plutarch's eight references to an unidentified Aristo. Von Arnim and Ioppolo have claimed all of them for the Chian, and Wehrli has claimed three for the Cean (22, 26–7).⁷⁵ We have to wonder why Plutarch left them unspecified. There are several possibilities. One is that Plutarch was careless and forgot how misleading a reference to an unspecified Aristo could be. Another is that he felt it did not matter if his readers knew exactly which Aristo he meant. Finally, he may have felt that his readers knew one of the Aristos so well that an unspecified reference would be understood, especially if it fit the author's profile. The last becomes a likely explanation, if the references all fit a discernible profile, and they do.

If we look at the unspecified references, we quickly notice that seven are clever apophthegms, all but one of which involve comparisons. We may recall that one of Plutarch's quotations from Aristo of Chios is an apophthegm that implicitly compares common people to wild beasts

⁷³ Eratosthenes wrote a work named after his teacher Aristo of Chios (Ath. 7 281C = *SVF* 1.341). Of course, the most famous example was Plato.

⁷⁴ It also fits well with Cicero's statement in *Cato* about an Aristo who put a speech about old age into the mouth of a mythological figure. Plutarch goes on to talk about works that mix teaching about the soul with mythology; but the text is uncertain at the point of connection, and we do not know if this was a separate example (as most editors construct the text) or a relative clause describing the *Lyco* (as Wehrli conjectures); cf. Edelstein (1955) 419. If Plutarch meant this to describe the *Lyco*, it becomes even more difficult to ascribe the *Lyco* to Aristo the Stoic, who denied the possibility and value of physical subjects like the soul. On comparative grounds, the Peripatetic looks like an even more likely candidate for the object of Plutarch's reference.

⁷⁵ Wehrli's claim has been refuted by Edelstein (1955) 415–16.

(*Max. princ.* 776C = *SVF* 1.382); and Diogenes' *Life of Aristo* of Chios contains several vivid similes: e.g., a wise man is like a good actor, who whether given the role of Thersites or Agamemnon plays it appropriately (7.160); and dialectical discussions are like spider webs, which though they seem to display some artistic talent are useless (7.161). Moreover, we shall soon see that Stobaeus quotes many such comparisons from a collection of Aristo of Chios that he called simply *Comparisons* (Ὅμοιώματα). That makes it likely that all the apophthegms involving comparisons in Plutarch come from the Chian. Moreover, the one that has no comparison can be assigned to the Chian on the basis of its Stoic content (*Exil.* 601E = *SVF* 1.371). We may well speculate on the basis of Plutarch's practice that Aristonean apophthegms and comparisons had entered common speech, like Shakespearean phrases in English, and that there was no need for a writer like Plutarch to make a special effort to document his source.

The next major source for references to Aristo of Ceos is Athenaeus, who lived in the late second century CE, around the time of Diogenes Laertius. At last we find an author who makes our task of identification easy. He knew both the Cean and the Chian. The Chian appears only as a subject within quotations of other authors, Timon of Phlius (6 251C = *SVF* 1.342) or Eratosthenes (7 281C–D = *SVF* 1.341). The Cean, on the other hand, was quoted five times. Four times Athenaeus specifically calls him Aristo of Ceos (13 563F = **13A**, 15 674B = **10**, 2 38F = **12**) or gives the title of his source as *Erotic Examples* (Ἐρωτικὰ ὁμοῖα, 10 419C = **11**), or both. The only reference which does not include one or the other identifier (13 564A = **13A**) follows a few lines (one excerpt) after an excerpt from the *Erotic Examples* specifically attributed to the Cean (563F = **13A**). Its erotic subject matter confirms attribution to the Cean. It is worth noting that none of these is an apophthegm or contains a simile or analogy like the unattributed excerpts found in Plutarch or the apophthegms attributed to Aristo of Chios by Diogenes Laertius.

For confirmation of the attribution of apophthegms containing analogies to Aristo of Chios, we may finally turn to Stobaeus, the last of the authors who have been mined for fragments of Aristo of Ceos.⁷⁶ Stobaeus excerpts a substantial number of quotations that he identifies

⁷⁶ Wehrli admitted only one, fr. 26. Its attribution was adequately rejected by Edelstein (1955) 415.

as taken from an unspecified Aristo. Most of them he specifically attributes to Aristo's *Comparisons* ('Ομοιώματα).⁷⁷ Not only that, in one (*Ecl.* 2.2.14 = *SVF* 1.392), he quotes the very simile that Diogenes quotes in his *Life of Aristo* of Chios (7.160 = *SVF* 1.351), namely, that dialectical discussions are like spider webs. There is no evidence that Stobaeus ever excerpted anything directly from Aristo of Ceos or even had access to his work. We have to conclude that all of Stobaeus' excerpts labeled as Aristo are from Aristo of Chios.⁷⁸ We should also note that his information that Aristo of Chios composed a work entitled *Comparisons* is found nowhere else and confirms the implication of the apophthegms in Plutarch and Diogenes that Aristo of Chios had a propensity for short, punchy apophthegms that used analogies to make his point.⁷⁹ Ironically, Stobaeus may contain a quotation from Aristo of Ceos after all. It is found in an excerpt that Stobaeus took from Porphyry and that refers to an Aristo who held a Peripatetic view of the soul (1.49.24 = **29**). Unfortunately, we do not know whether it refers to Aristo of Ceos or Aristo of Alexandria.⁸⁰

6. Conclusion: Recovering Faded Memories

Looking back over the authors that were familiar with the two Aristos, we can get a picture of the reputational fate of the two Aristos. Aristo of Ceos seems to have come to the attention of the ancient world outside the Peripatos first through the succession literature. That is how Cicero and Plutarch knew him. It was a picture that gradually faded to a bare outline, and in one case (Clement) Aristo even dropped out. In Cicero's time, when the picture was still more vivid, the character of Aristo's writings and literary style was remembered along with his role in the Peripatos. The observation about his writings was eventually lost. Plutarch had no interest in it for his particular use of the Peripatetic succession, and it never appears again in the late classical and medieval tradition. Not even Diogenes knew it anymore. But while the memory

⁷⁷ Ten of fifteen excerpts in von Arnim's collection are expressly assigned to the 'Ομοιώματα: *SVF* 1.350, 383–4, 386–7, 392, 394, 396–7, 399.

⁷⁸ Cf. Ioppolo (1980) 308–12.

⁷⁹ This title has not been preserved among the titles of Diogenes' bibliography, unless it is a part of, or another name for, the *Chreia*.

⁸⁰ Aristo of Ceos: Edelstein (1955) 418–19, Sharples (2002). Aristo of Alexandria: Grilli (1971). Aristo of Chios: von Arnim, *SVF* 1.377. Omitted by Wehrli (1952).

of Aristo's role as scholar and of the nature of his writings was fading away, his written works themselves were beginning to receive more attention. Cicero probably knew one on old age, and Plutarch knew a work that Aristo of Ceos wrote about his teacher Lyco. Plutarch also read and quoted from Aristo's writings on lovers of the past. So did Athenaeus a century later, who tells us that Aristo wrote at least two books of *Erotic Examples*, and more than a century after that Themistius was still passing on a story about the respect and affection that Lyco had for his student Aristo.

These same authors also knew Aristo of Chios. Cicero knew him only second-hand through the biographical and doxographical literature. This literature was sufficient to keep a knowledge of Aristo's basic teaching and some of his apophthegms alive outside the Stoa, even while his reputation within the Stoa was under a cloud. By the first century CE, however, his writings were circulating. Seneca discusses Aristo's philosophy (*Ep.* 95, summarized in 95.2–3 = *SVF* 1.358; cf. *Ep.* 115.8–9 = *SVF* 1.372), and Plutarch cites him among the classics of Greek philosophy. Plutarch also knew and quoted his writing on orators (*Against the Orators*). His best known literary production, however, was his collection of apophthegms. Plutarch quotes those frequently and Stobaeus even more. Aristo of Chios probably had little to say about food, because Athenaeus, who culled ancient literature for such references, quotes nothing from him, though he knew who he was. All the while, historical and biographical handbooks continued to preserve his basic ideas and his connection to the history of the Stoa, as Diogenes Laertius shows.

Throughout this entire period, there is no evidence of any confusion between the two Aristos in the minds of any readers who knew them.⁸¹ The charge of confusion is often repeated in modern literature, but it cannot be substantiated for the ancients; confusion can be found only among modern interpreters. The charge seems to be due to one minor incident that was quickly forgotten. That was Panaetius' attempt to distance himself and the Stoic school from Aristo's ideas by alleging that the philosophical works circulating under his name were all really written by Aristo of Ceos. We know of no one other than early succession-

⁸¹ We can also observe that though more philosophers with the name of Aristo became active later in the Peripatos, these never received the degree of public attention that Aristo of Chios and Aristo of Ceos did.

writers, like Sosicrates, who shared his view. Even Diogenes, who reports the story, does not endorse it. But his report turned an isolated ancient delusion into a widespread modern confusion that we are still trying to sort out.

Works Cited

- Alesse, F. 1997. *Panezio di Rodi: Testimonianze* (Naples: Bibliopolis).
- Alfonsi, L. 1957. "Su Arisone di Ceo," *Aevum* 31: 366–7.
- Algra, K. A. 1997. "Chrysippus, Carneades, Cicero: The ethical *divisiones* in Cicero's Lucullus," in *Assent and Argument: Studies in Cicero's "Academic Books,"* ed. B. Inwood and J. Mansfeld (Leiden: Brill), 107–39.
- Algra, K., J. Barnes, J. Mansfeld, M. Schofield, eds. 1999. *Cambridge History of Ancient Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Andria, R. G. 1989. *I frammenti delle "Successioni dei filosofi"* (Naples: Arte Tipographica).
- Barnes, J. 1989. "Antiochus of Ascalon," in *Philosophia Togata*, ed. M. Griffin and J. Barnes (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 51–96.
- Brink, K. O. 1940. "Peripatos," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, Suppl. 7 (Stuttgart: Metzler), 899–949.
- Crönert, W. 1906. *Kolotes und Menedemus*, Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde 6 (Leipzig: Avenarius; repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1965).
- Dionisotti, A. C. 1997. "On Fragments in Classical Scholarship," in Most (1997), 1–33.
- Dorandi, T. 1982. "Filodemo. Gli Stoici (*PHerc.* 155 e 339)," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 12: 91–133.
- — —. 1991. *Filodemo, Storia dei Filosofi: Platone e l'Accademia* (*PHerc.* 1021 e 164) (Naples: Bibliopolis).
- Edelstein, L. 1955. Review of Wehrli (1952), *American Journal of Philology* 76: 414–22.
- Ferrary, J.-L. 1988. *Philhellénisme et Impérialisme* (Rome: École Française de Rome).
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. 1997. "Aristo of Iulis on Ceos," in *Encyclopedia of Classical Philosophy*, ed. D. J. Zeyl (Westport, CN: Greenwood), 55–6.

- Fraser, P. M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Gercke, A. 1896. "Ariston [no. 53] von Kos," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart: Metzler), 956.
- Gigante, M. 1986. "Biografia e dossografia in Diogene Laerzio," in *Diogene Laerzio: storico del pensiero antico = Elenchos 7*: 7–102.
- — —. 1996. "Aristone di Ceo biografo dei filosofi," *Studi Classici e Orientali* 46: 17–23.
- Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. 1992. "Le livre VI de Diogène Laërce: Analyse de sa structure et réflexions méthodologiques," *ANRW II.36.6* (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter), 3880–4048.
- Gottschalk, H. B. 1972. "Notes on the Wills of the Peripatetic Scholars," *Hermes* 100: 314–42.
- — —. 1987. "Aristotelian Philosophy in the Roman World from the Time of Cicero to the End of the Second Century A.D.," *ANRW II.36.2* (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter), 1079–174.
- Grafton, A. 1997. "Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum: Fragments of Some Lost Enterprises," in Most (1997), 124–43.
- Grilli, A. 1971. "Un frammento d'Aristone Alessandrino in Porfirio," *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 23: 292–307.
- Hahm, D. E., 1992. "Diogenes Laertius VII: On the Stoics," *ANRW II.36.6* (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter), 4076–182, 4404–11.
- — —. 2001. Review of I.G. Kidd, *Posidonius*, vol. 3: *The Translation of the Fragments*, *American Journal of Philology* 122: 445–7.
- — —. 2002. "Zeno Before and After Stoicism," in *Zeno of Citium and his Legacy: The Philosophy of Zeno*, ed. T. Scaltsas and A. S. Mason (Larnaca: Municipality of Larnaca), 31–56.
- Ioppolo, A. M. 1980. *Aristone di Chio e lo stoicismo antico* (Naples: Bibliopolis).
- Kidd, I. 1997. "What is a Posidonian Fragment?," in Most (1997), 225–36.
- Kienle, W. von. 1961. *Die Berichte über die Sukzessionen der Philosophen in der hellenistischen und spät antiken Literatur* (Berlin: von Kienle).
- Laks, A. 1976. "Edition Critique et Commentée de la Vie d'Épicure dans Diogène Laërce (X,1–34)," *Cahiers de Philologie* 1 (Lille: Publications de l'Université de Lille), 1–118.
- — —. 1997. "Du témoignage comme fragment," in Most (1997), 236–72.

- Lévy, C. 1980. "Un problème doxographique chez Cicéron: les indifférentistes," *Revue des Études Latines* 58: 238–51.
- — —. 1992. *Cicero Academicus: Recherches sur les Académiques et sur la philosophie cicéronienne* (Rome: École Française de Rome).
- Lynch, J. P. 1972. *Aristotle's School: A Study of a Greek Educational Institution* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Mansfeld, J. 1986. "Diogenes Laertius on Stoic Philosophy," in *Diogene Laertio: Storico del Pensiero Antico*, *Elenchos* 7: 297–382; repr. in Mansfeld, *Studies in the Historiography of Greek Philosophy* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1990), 343–428.
- — —. 1992. *Heresiography in Context: Hippolytus' Elenchos as a Source for Greek Philosophy* (Leiden: Brill).
- — —. 1999. "Sources," in Algra (1999), 3–30.
- Mariotti, I. 1966. *Aristone d'Alessandria: Edizione e Interpretazione* (Bologna: Riccardo Pàtron).
- Mejer, J. 1978. *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background*, *Hermes Einzelshrift* 40 (Wiesbaden: Steiner).
- Most, G. W., ed. 1997. *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente Sammeln*, *Aporemata* 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Moraux, P. 1951. *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* (Louvain: Éditions Universitaires de Louvain).
- — —. 1973. *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen von Andronikos bis Alexander von Aphrodisias*, vol. 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- Osborne, C. 1987. *Rethinking Early Greek Philosophy: Hippolytus of Rome and the Presocratics* (London: Duckworth).
- Philippson, R. 1929. "Panaetiana," *Rheinisches Museum* 78: 337–60.
- Pohlenz, M. 1948. *Die Stoa: Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*. 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; 3d ed. 1964).
- Powell, J. G. F. 1988. *Cicero: Cato Maior De Senectute* (Cambridge: University Press).
- Runia, D. T. 1998. "Herakleides [no. 19]," *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 5 (Stuttgart-Weimar: Metzler), 375–6.
- — —. 2001. "Sotion [no. 2]," *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 11 (Stuttgart-Weimar: Metzler), 755.
- Sharples, R. 2001. "Sotion [no. 1]," *Der Neue Pauly*, vol. 11 (Stuttgart-Weimar: Metzler), 754–5.
- — —. 2002a. "Ariston [no. 3] of Ceos," *Brill's New Pauly*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill), 1119–20.

- — —. 2002b. "Ariston [no. 4] of Cos," *Brill's New Pauly*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill), 1120.
- — —. 2002c. "Ariston [no. 5] of Cos, the Younger," *Brill's New Pauly*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill), 1120.
- Sollenberger, M. G. 1992. "The Lives of the Peripatetics: An Analysis of the Contents and Structure of Diogenes Laertius' *Vitae philosophorum* Book 5," *ANRW* II.36.6 (Berlin & New York: de Gruyter), 3793–879.
- von Arnim, H. 1900. *De Aristonis Peripatetici apud Philodemum vestigiis* (Rostock: Typis Academicis Adlerianis).
- — —, ed. 1903–24. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. 4 vols. (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Wehrli, F. 1952/1968. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 6: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (Basel: Schwabe).
- — —. 1959/1969. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 10: *Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler* (Basel: Schwabe).
- — —. 1968. "Ariston [52] von Iulis auf Keos," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, Suppl. 11 (Stuttgart: Druckenmüller), 156–9.
- — —. 1978. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Supplement 2: *Sotion* (Basel: Schwabe).
- — —. 1983. "Ariston von Keos," in *Die Philosophie der Antike*, vol. 3: *Ältere Akademie, Aristotles—Peripatos*, ed. H. Flashar (Basel: Schwabe), 579–81.
- Zeller, E. 1897. *Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics*, trans. B. F. C. Costelloe and J. H. Muirhead (New York: Russell and Russell; repr. 1962).



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

3

I frammenti papiracei di Aristone di Ceo

Tiziano Dorandi

Il problema più difficile che gli editori dei frammenti del filosofo peripatetico Aristone di Ceo si trovano a affrontare è, senza dubbio, quello di determinare l'identità dell'Aristone citato da Filodemo nella sezione finale del libro *Περὶ ὑπερηφανίας* (*PHerc.* 1008): si tratta del peripatetico di Ceo oppure del suo omonimo stoico di Chio?

Altre questioni meno gravi, certo, ma altrettanto pressanti non sono tuttavia da trascurare. Filodemo ha copiato gli estratti di Aristone da un solo scritto, il *Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας* citato nella col. 10.11–12, oppure da due distinti? Come deve essere inteso il titolo *Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας*? Che genere di opera era quella di Aristone? Il *Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας* è da identificare con gli *Ὑπομνήματα ὑπὲρ κενοδοξίας* che Diogene Laerzio (7.163) elenca nel catalogo degli scritti di Aristone di Chio, ma che Panezio e Sosicrate attribuivano a Aristone peripatetico? Fin dove si estende la citazione di Aristone, e a che punto Filodemo riprende la parola?

Molte di queste domande hanno già ricevuto una risposta soddisfacente e in qualche caso definitiva; ancora irrisolto resta tuttavia il problema dell'identificazione di Aristone. Per oltre un secolo e mezzo, generazioni di studiosi hanno dato vita a un lungo dibattito

senza giungere a una soluzione unitaria forse anche a causa della mancanza di argomenti veramente decisivi *pro* o *contra* una delle due candidature. Entrambe le ipotesi poggiano infatti su presupposti talora soggettivi (l'opinione radicata che l'interesse per lo studio dei caratteri era specifico alla scuola peripatetica) o ancora *sub iudice* (il valore del giudizio di Panezio e Sosicrate sull'autenticità degli scritti attribuiti ai due Aristone). Né indifferente è la mancanza di una moderna edizione del libro filodemeo dopo quella di Jensen.

Le pretese del mio contributo sono assai limitate. Ho cercato di presentare un bilancio sommario del dibattito relativo all'insieme delle questioni appena elencate. Queste pagine vogliono pertanto servire da introduzione sommaria alla scelta dei testi papiracei di Aristone che abbiamo pubblicato nella raccolta dei frammenti del filosofo peripatetico di Ceo che apre il volume.¹

Con una decisione che non ritengo arbitraria ho deciso di affrontare le questioni nell'ordine inverso a quello in cui le ho sopra presentate. Nella prima parte, discuto i problemi testuali della col. 10.10–30 del Περὶ ὑπερῆφανίας filodemeo dove per la prima volta leggiamo il nome del filosofo Aristone e il titolo del suo scritto; mi soffermo poi sull'estensione, la consistenza e il contenuto del Περὶ τοῦ κομφίξειν ὑπερῆφανίας di Aristone. Nella seconda, analizzo altre due testimonianze di Filodemo su Aristone, una già raccolta da Wehrli, l'altra scoperta troppo tardi perché lo studioso potesse tenerne conto. Anche in questi due casi, Filodemo attacca le posizioni di un Aristone del quale non è specificato se si trattava del filosofo di Ceo o di quello di Chio. Nella terza, infine, riassumo nelle grandi linee la storia delle ricerche relative all'identità di Aristone. Tre almeno i motivi per cui ho deciso di relegare all'ultima posizione la spinosa e cruciale domanda: Aristone di Ceo o Aristone di Chio? Primo: non sono riuscito a trovare né una nuova via di ricerca né nuovi argomenti a favore o contro una delle due possibilità. Secondo: non si può tentare di rispondere a questa domanda se non dopo aver definito, esaminato e eventualmente risposto alle altre questioni preliminari. Terzo: alla questione sono dedicati, in questo stesso volume, i contributi di Graziano Ranocchia, Voula Tsouna e Sabine Vogt, e il soggetto è affrontato con ricchezza di argomenti e nuove prospettive da Anna Angeli e Mario Capasso.²

¹ Curata da P. Stork, W.W. Fortenbaugh, J. van Ophuijsen e da me medesimo.

² Vedi rispettivamente, *infra*, e Angeli-Capasso in un contributo ancora inedito

1. Il Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας di Aristone

Qualche dettaglio sullo stato di conservazione del papiro e sulle edizioni disponibili costituisce una premessa necessaria.³ Gli estratti di Aristone occupano le colonne finali del *PHerc.* 1008, un rotolo che conserva i resti del libro decimo dell'opera *Sui vizi* (Περὶ κακιῶν) del filosofo epicureo Filodemo di Gadara (I sec. a. C.), meglio conosciuto con il titolo Περὶ ὑπερηφανίας (*Sulla superbia*).⁴ L'edizione completa più attendibile di quel libro venne pubblicata da Christian Jensen (1911a) a partire da una autopsia del papiro. La sezione su Aristone è stata riedita dal Wehrli,⁵ tenendo conto anche di interventi testuali successivi all'edizione di Jensen, in particolare alcune correzioni suggerite da quello studioso al proprio discepolo Knögel (1933). Più di recente, Capasso (1983) ha riproposto una ricostruzione della col. 10.10–30, Anna Angeli e Acosta Méndez (1992) hanno divulgato una revisione delle colonne 10 e 21–23, mentre Gigante ha contribuito alla ricostruzione e all'esegesi di singoli passi. Una nuova edizione delle colonne 10 e 21–3 ha curato Ranocchia (2001). Anna Angeli e Mario Capasso hanno altresì messo a mia disposizione il manoscritto di un volumetto di prossima pubblicazione, dove Anna Angeli propone, tra l'altro, una nuova ricostruzione e interpretazione della col. 10. In attesa della pubblicazione dell'edizione completa del Περὶ ὑπερηφανίας, annunciata da Indelli,⁶ è di tutti questi contributi che ho tenuto conto nella stesura del mio intervento.⁷

messo a mia disposizione. Grazie alla cortese disponibilità dei due autori ho potuto usufruire e divulgare, in anteprima, una parte dei loro risultati innovanti e, a mio parere, convincenti. Va da sé che chiunque voglia tenere conto ulteriormente di queste pagine (finché inedite) è invitato a contattare per un accordo i due studiosi.

³ Per maggiori informazioni, rimando a Indelli (2001) 693–6 e (2003) e a Ranocchia (2001) 236–42.

⁴ Il titolo del rotolo è Φιλοδήμου Περὶ κακιῶν I. Il titolo Περὶ ὑπερηφανίας è stato congettualmente attribuito allo scritto in ragione del suo contenuto.

⁵ Wehrli (1968) 33–40: fr. 13–14.

⁶ Indelli (2001).

⁷ Una traduzione in inglese dei frammenti papiracei di Aristone (la prima completa finora pubblicata) accompagna la nostra raccolta di frammenti (19–21). Il fr. 14 Wehrli (= 21g–o) era già stato tradotto in inglese da Rusten (1993) 182–95 e in italiano da Gigante (1997b) 345–56 = (1999) 128–33. Le colonne 10 e 21–3 del *PHerc.* 1008 da Acosta Méndez – Angeli (1992) 182–4 e da Ranocchia (2001) 250–2.

Nelle linee 10-13 della colonna 10 del *PHerc.* 1008, Filodemo fa riferimento, per la prima volta, alla lettera di un non meglio specificato Aristone intitolata *Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας*, *Sull'alleggerimento della superbia*.⁸ Ecco il testo della parte centrale della colonna (10.10–30) quale pubblicato dalla Angeli (e da noi riproposto anche nell'edizione dei frammenti di Aristone), accompagnato dalla traduzione della medesima studiosa e da alcune osservazioni largamente fondate sulle pagine del suo commento:

- 10 Ἀρίστων
το[ί]νυν [γ]ε[γ]ραφὼς Περὶ τοῦ
κο[υ]φίζειν ὑπερηφανίας ἐ-
πιστολή[ν τ]ι [ἥ]διον μὲν ἔ-
παθεν τῶν διὰ τύχην ὑπερ-
15 ηφ[ά]νων [ἐκ]είνων, οὐ μό-
νο[v] διὰ τ[ιν] ἄλλο τούτου ὑπερ-
ηφανοῦν[τω]ν, ἀλλὰ καὶ
δι' ἃ πρόείπαμεν ἡμεῖς καὶ
δῆ[τ]α καὶ δι' αὐτὴν φιλοσο-
20 φί[αν] πολλῶν δοξάντων
ὥς [Ἡρ]ακλείτου καὶ Πυθαγό-
ρου καὶ Ἐ[μ]πεδοκλέους καὶ
Σωκράτους καὶ ποιητῶν ἐνί-
ων οὓς οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν κω-
25 μωιδोगράφων ἐπερ(ρ)άπιζον.
'Αλλ' ὅμως, εἴ τινα πείσει, κ[α-]
θάπ[ερ] οὐκ ἂν ἀπεικ(ότ)ως τι-
νὰ πείσειεν περὶ ὧν ἀπετέ-
μετο, κεφαλαιώσομαι τὰς
30 δυνάμεις αὐτῶν.

Pertanto Aristone, pur avendo scritto una lettera *Sull'alleggerimento della superbia*, sperimentò un'ingenuità maggiore rispetto a quelli (che diventano) superbi per la fortuna, giacché si diventa superbi non solo in forza di alcuni eventi che sono in potere della sorte, ma anche per le ragioni che noi esponemmo sopra, e di certo molti apparvero esserlo anche proprio per la filosofia, come Eraclito, Pitagora, Empedocle e Socrate e alcuni poeti che gli antichi tra i commediografi sferzarono. Pur tuttavia, se alcune affermazioni (di Aristone) saranno convincenti, come appunto non a torto potrebbero convincere alcuni suoi argomenti sulle tematiche che ritagliò per proprio conto, di quelle io esporrò per sommi capi i punti salienti.

⁸ Gigante (1996a) 132 n. 16 e (1997a) 154 n. 24 suggerisce di intendere *κουφίζειν* come equivalente di *κουφίζεσθαι* “liberarsi” e così traduce il titolo: *Sul liberarsi dalla superbia*.

Dopo avere stabilito, nella col. 9, “le norme grazie alle quali il superbo rivede i rapporti con gli altri e con se stesso liberandosi per un verso dal disprezzo, per l’altro dall’autoesaltazione,” Filodemo conclude con le linee 8–10 della colonna 10 la sezione del libro riservata al decalogo sulla guarigione dalla superbia. “Secondo Filodemo la superbia attecchisce nell’animo di chi, costituzionalmente disposto a riceverla, si misura con contesti sociali e marginali o comunque a lui subalterni, indietreggia invece dinanzi al potere, in qualunque forma esso si manifesti.”⁹ A partire dalla linea 10 della medesima colonna, comincia un periodo “contrassegnato da una serrata ipotassi” e seminato di “difficoltà ermeneutiche sollevate nelle ll. 12–15 soprattutto dalla controversa presenza di sottoposti.”

Nella sua recente edizione, Ranocchia così propone di restituire e traduce il testo di Filodemo (ll. 12–17):¹⁰

ἐπιστολικά τ[ὸ ἴδιον μὲν ἔπαθεν [τῶ]ν δ[ιὰ] τύχην ὑπερ[ε]ρηφ[ά]νων
[ἄφρόν]ων, οὐ μόνον[ν] διὰ τ[ὰ] ὑπ[ὲρ] ταύτης ὑπερ[ε]ρηφ[ά]νο[υ] [ν]τω]ν κτλ.

(Aristone) ... patì ciò che è proprio degli stolti divenuti superbi a causa della fortuna, sebbene non vadano superbi soltanto per le congetture prodotte da queste etc.

La Angeli ha ora potuto dimostrare che questa ricostruzione è fondata su false basi testuali e che deve pertanto essere rifiutata. La rinnovata autopsia del papiro ha messo in evidenza l’inconsistenza delle letture ἐπιστολικά (l. 12–13) e τ[ὸ ἴδιον] (l. 13). Nel primo caso, viene confermata la lezione ἐπιστολή[ν] di contro a ἐπιστολικά suggerito da Gigante e accolto da Ranocchia.¹¹ Le lettere che si intravedono sul papiro, dopo ΕΠΙCΤΟΛΗ, e cioè ΕΛ[.]Α[...Υ, appartengono a uno strato sottoposto che deve essere ripristinato nella l. 14 di col. 9 a ricomporre la sequenza ὡφελέ[ι]ας τ[ο]ῦ (ὡφ[ε]λέ[ι]ας aveva già integrato Jensen). Il genere dello scritto di Aristone — una lettera (ἐπιστολή),¹² e non una epitome (ἐπιτομή)—¹³ è dunque

⁹ La Angeli richiama opportunamente il passo parallelo in col. 9.20–4.

¹⁰ Ranocchia (2001) 244, 250.

¹¹ Gigante (1997a) 153–4; Ranocchia (2001) 244.

¹² Ἐπιστολήν avevano già letto Jensen (1911a) 16 e (1911b) 397; Gallavotti (1927) 473 n. 2; Acosta Méndez-Angeli (1992) 151, 208–11.

¹³ Ἐπιτομήν aveva suggerito Jensen (1930) 57 n. 11 = (1979) 21 n. 11, e con lui

definitivamente acquisito. Il recupero successivo di τ[ι] [ῥ]ιδιον (l. 13) della Angeli invece di τ[ὸ] ῥιδιον di Jensen,¹⁴ ribadito da Ranocchia,¹⁵ libera il passo filodemeo dall'improbabile e ostico costruito τὸ ῥιδιον ἔπαθεν e invalida di conseguenza la "funzione annominale attribuita prevalentemente al genitivo τῶν ὑπερηφάνων." Anche [ἄφρόν]ων, congetturato da Ranocchia (che non esclude nel commento le forme alternative [Ἐλλήν]ων, [ἐνδόξ]ων, [ἐταίρ]ων),¹⁶ è invalidata dal riesame autoptico del papiro. Le tracce superstiti si accordano piuttosto con [ἐκ]εῖ[ν]ων. Tenendo conto di questi risultati, la Angeli ha così ricostruito l'intero periodo (10–15): Ἀρίστων το[ί]νων [γ]ε[γ]ραφὼς Περὶ τοῦ | κο[υ]φίζ[ειν] ὑπερηφανίας ἐπιστολή[ν] τ[ι] [ῥ]ιδιον μὲν ἔπαθεν τῶν διὰ τύχην ὑπερηφ[ά]νων [ἐκ]εῖ[ν]ων, dove τῶν ... ὑπερηφ[ά]νων [ἐκ]εῖ[ν]ων (14–15) deve essere inteso come un genitivo di paragone retto da ῥιδιον (13).

"L'espressione τ[ι] [ῥ]ιδιον μὲν ἔπαθεν" — commenta la Angeli¹⁷ — "riceve una connotazione polemica dall'aggettivo ῥδύς che associa alla valenza positiva quella negativa di 'ingenuo, sciocco,' equipollente a εὐήθης, ἄφρων, ὑπόμωρος [vedi Dodds (1959) 294, comm. a Plat., *Grg.* 491E2]. Tale uso trova la sua autorevole attestazione in Platone dove ῥδύς designa anche la persona che o non riesce a cogliere la corrispondenza tra significato e significante [*Euthyd.* 300A] o ad una ricerca dà soluzioni opposte a quelle ritenute valide [*Grg.* 491E] oppure tenta di semplificare una situazione a proprio vantaggio [*Resp.* 1 337D]. ῥδύς mentre nel primo degli anzi detti esempi contraddistingue Eutidemo e negli altri due Socrate, nella *Resp.* 7 527D è rivolto da Socrate a qualificare Glaucone, suo interlocutore nel dibattito sull'educazione da impartire ai filosofi reggitori dello Stato perfetto. Di fronte alla proposta di Glaucone di porre come terza disciplina, dopo l'aritmetica e la geometria, l'astronomia in quanto utile all'agricoltura, alla nautica e alla strategia, Socrate giudica Glaucone un tipo divertente perché palesa il timore di incorrere nell'accusa del volgo di prescrivere lo studio di materie inutili. Qui l'asserzione ῥδύς εἶ non media

si sono allineati Knögel (1933) 8–10; Wehrli (1968) fr. 13 I; Capasso (1983) 452–3; Mouraviev (1987) 22 e (1999) 172.

¹⁴ Jensen *apud* Knögel (1933) 8.

¹⁵ Ranocchia (2001) 244, 257–9.

¹⁶ Ranocchia (2001) 257–8.

¹⁷ I rinvii che si leggono entro parentesi quadre riassumono schematicamente il contenuto delle note della Angeli, che ho qui omesso.

semplicemente, come nei precedenti passaggi, il rimprovero, meritato o immeritato che sia, di un errore logico-opinativo e/o comportamentale, ma sottende la rilevazione da parte del maestro di un pregiudizio nell'alunno che gli impedisce di progredire speditamente nel ragionamento: Glaucone non ha fatto ancora suo il principio secondo cui ogni scienza va coltivata per scopi conoscitivi e non in vista del vantaggio individuale né dell'utilità pratica. Non v'è dubbio che a questo luogo del libro 7 della *Repubblica* alluse Aristone laddove nella sua *Lettera* [col. 22.30–3 = fr. **21m** 30–3 SFOD] tratteggiando il carattere dell'εἴρων attraverso la figura di Socrate, ne mise a fuoco anche il linguaggio ridondante di aggettivazioni e di termini anfibologici tra i quali appunto ἡδύς. Né possiamo dubitare che Filodemo conoscesse l'utilizzo che di questa voce aveva fatto Platone, visto che ad essa il Gadareno ricorse nel libro 4 del trattato *Sulla morte* per denotare chi non ha elaborato della morte la corretta nozione [Phld., *De morte* 4, col. 21.3–6 Kuiper: ἐπὶ δὲ το[ῖ]ς μηδὲν ἀ[γα]θὸν ἐσχηκόσιν ἐὰν χαίρη(ι) ¹⁵ τις, ἡδ[ύ]ς ἔσται χαίρων ἐπὶ τοῖς κακῶν]. Nella col. 10 del libro *Sulla superbia* ἡδύς non qualifica la persona, ma nel nesso col pronome indefinito significa l'ingenuità di chi, in conseguenza di un percorso ragionato non del tutto lineare e coerente, adotta un comportamento che risulta agli altri divertente. Secondo Filodemo Aristone sperimentò una condizione tale da apparire più sprovvisto e sciocco di quanto non siano i superbi διὰ τύχην. Tale rilievo è argomentato nei genitivi assoluti alle ll. 15–24, dove Filodemo puntualizza che la superbia non origina esclusivamente dagli eventi in potere della sorte, ma altresì dalle ragioni da lui in precedenza addotte e anche dalla filosofia.”

Se accettiamo questo testo e la relativa esegesi, possiamo dedurre come conseguenza che Filodemo vede in Aristone non un superbo διὰ τύχην, bensì un superbo διὰ φιλοσοφίαν. L'incoerenza che l'epicureo rinfaccia a Aristone “nasce da una condotta di vita impostata su una eccessiva autostima, lesiva del rispetto e della dignità degli altri, in aperta antitesi con i parametri etici enunciati nell'epistola sulla liberazione dalla superbia. . . . Filodemo, dunque, respinse il ruolo assoluto che Aristone aveva assegnato alla fortuna nell'insorgenza della superbia, e ciò in perfetto accordo con la prospettiva di libertà che Epicuro aveva voluto aprire, per l'uomo, nell'orizzonte esistenziale altrimenti rigidamente deterministico.” Questa interpretazione porta a preferire alla linea 16, invece di τ[ὰ ἄ]π[ρο] congetturato da Wehrli, il

supplemento τ[ι]ν' ἄ]πὸ di Gigante,¹⁸ “che lega il contesto filodemeo al celebre passo della *Lettera a Meneceo* [133] in cui degli eventi alcuni sono detti verificarsi per necessità, altri derivare dal caso (ἃ δὲ ἀπὸ τύχης), altri dipendere dagli uomini. In quest'ultima categoria Filodemo incluse quei personaggi del mondo culturale che, al di là dell'apporto dato alla filosofia e alla poesia, si erano comunque segnalati per l'insuperbimento che avevano in loro attivato la consapevolezza e spesso anche il pubblico riconoscimento del loro valore.”

Il testo delle linee 28–9 è ripristinato da Ranocchia:¹⁹ Jensen (1911b) aveva accolto la congettura di Sudhaus [πρὸ]ε[ί]λετο. La lettura ἐπετέμετο di Knögel (accolta da Wehrli e Ácosta Méndez-Angeli) è definita “arbitraria” da Gigante²⁰ che preferisce ritornare a [πρὸ]ε[ί]λετο di Sudhaus/Jensen oppure di scrivere ἐξε(ί)λετο o ἐφε(ί)λετο nel senso di “ricapitolare.” Ranocchia è riuscito a leggere ἄπετέμετο, una lezione che è confortata dai disegni di Oxford (ΑΠΕΤΕΙΜΕΤΟ) e di Napoli (ΑΠΕΤΕΙΜΕΤΕ) e dalle tracce che si scorgono ancora sul papiro.²¹

Della lettera di Aristone intitolata *Sull'alleggerimento della superbia*, che conteneva i punti essenziali della dottrina di quel filosofo sulla superbia, Filodemo presenta ai suoi lettori una κεφαλαίωσις (10.29: κεφαλαίωσομαι τὰς δυνάμεις αὐτῶν) che occupa le attuali colonne 10.30–24.21 del papiro.²² Il motivo che lo spinse a produrre questa κεφαλαίωσις, esplicitato alle linee 26–9 della colonna 10, è ancora una volta bene spiegato dalla Angeli. La studiosa rifiuta l'ipotesi che il soggetto delle forme verbali πείσει e πείσειεν (26 e 28) sia Aristone e che l'oggetto indeterminato di esse siano i due pronomi indefiniti τινα (26 e 27–8): “A nostro parere,” — conclude la Angeli — “i due pronomi indefiniti fungono da soggetto delle corrispettive forme verbali sì che Filodemo marca ulteriormente la selezione da lui operata: egli giustifica la sua sinossi col riscontro in Aristone di concetti che, pur

¹⁸ Gigante *apud* Capasso (1983) 453 n. 160.

¹⁹ Ranocchia (2001) 244, 260.

²⁰ Gigante (1997a) 154.

²¹ Per il significato del verbo, al medio, “ritagliare per sé,” vedi **21a** n. 6 e Ranocchia (2001) 260 (la cui interpretazione complessiva del passo non mi sento tuttavia di condividere).

²² Per maggiori dettagli, vedi i contributi di Tsouna e Vogt in questo volume e Angeli-Capasso.

non sviluppando la problematica sulla superbia in tutta la sua complessa sfaccettatura, almeno limitatamente alle questioni dall'autore sondate mostravano coerenza argomentativa e forza persuasiva.”

Nella prima sezione (col. 10.30–16.28), Filodemo riporta, in forma indiretta,²³ le prescrizioni che Aristone aveva date per liberarsi dalla superbia: il superbo (ὑπερήφανος) deve pensare alle precedenti umiliazioni derivate dalla sorte; al repentino mutamento della sorte; non deve ingigantire la propria fortuna (col. 11); deve confrontarsi non con gli inferiori, ma con i superiori; allontanare da sé l'invidia (φθόρος) e il godimento dei mali altrui (ἐπιχαιρεκακία: col. 12); deve richiamare alla mente di coloro che sono troppo tracotanti esempi di moderazione e evitare ogni affettazione di alterigia (col. 13); essere disponibile a una piena collaborazione con gli altri (col. 14); fare un esame di coscienza della propria condizione al fine di rendersi conto di come l'insieme delle cose che lo rendono orgoglioso sono vili (col. 15). Queste avvertenze vengono comprovate, in larga parte, adducendo, a mo' di esempio, almeno un aneddoto storico o un detto di un personaggio famoso. Dalla superbia (ὑπερηφανία) deve essere distinta la magnanimità (μεγαλοψυχία); mentre il magnanimo disprezza i beni materiali perché è a questi superiore, il superbo si mostra orgoglioso per il loro possesso (col. 16).

Una breve frase è sufficiente a Filodemo per segnalare il passaggio dalla prima alla seconda sezione: τοσαῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱκανὰ καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐπειπεῖν (16.27–8). Nelle colonne finali (16.29–24.21), Filodemo completa l'esposizione teorica di Aristone con una rassegna di sette sottotipi o variazioni del tipo originario che è il superbo (ὁ ὑπερήφανος): ὁ αὐθάδης, ὁ αὐθέκαστος, ὁ παντειδήμων, ὁ σεμνοκόπος, ὁ εἴρων, ὁ εὐτελιστής ο ὁ ἐξευτελιστής, ὁ οὐδενωτής oppure ὁ ἐξουδενωτής. Filodemo cita questi estratti di Aristone nella loro scrittura letterale (φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων col. 16.34 e φησὶν col. 24.17) sebbene con qualche aggiunta personale e qualche taglio.²⁴

La lunga citazione da Aristone si conclude alla linea 21 della colonna 24. Le ultime linee (21–7) della colonna contengono la chiusa del decimo libro del trattato di Filodemo *Sui vizi*, come intuì il

²³ Jensen (1911b) 399–404.

²⁴ Jensen (1911b) 404–5.

Philippson,²⁵ e non dell'opera di Aristone, come sembra presupporre il Wehrli (fr. 14 IX 19–21). L'αὐτοῦ della linea 23 è da intendere in senso avverbiale “qui” e non come un genitivo “di costui,” cioè di Aristone:

καὶ τὸν ὑπομνημα[τισ]μὸν δὲ | τοῦτον αὐτοῦ καταπαύσομεν, | ἐπισυνάψομεν
δ' αὐτῷ τὸν | περὶ ἄλλων κακιῶν ὧν | δοκιμάζομεν ποι[εῖ]σθαι | λόγον.

E terminiamo qui questa trattazione, alla quale ne faremo seguire una relativa agli altri vizi di cui riteniamo giusto tenere conto.

Fino al Wehrli, la critica non aveva avuto dubbi sul fatto che Filodemo avesse attinto tutti gli estratti di Aristone da un'unica fonte, il Περί τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας. Per il Wehrli invece la prima serie di estratti (col. 10.10–16.28)²⁶ proviene dal Περί τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας, uno scritto di carattere etico-parenetico nel quale lo studioso ravvisa “unser ältestes Beispiel der moralphilosophischen Protreptik hellenistischer Zeit”;²⁷ mentre la seconda (16.29–24.21)²⁸ deriva da un non specificato trattato di caratteriologia, “eine umfassende Darstellung menschlicher Charaktere, ein bedeutendes Zeugnis peripatetischer Erfahrungswissenschaft auch auf ethischem Gebiet.”²⁹

Presupporre una duplicità della fonte è superfluo: Aristone scrisse un'unica opera, la lettera Περί τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας, perché gli uomini si liberassero dalla superbia; a tale fine vi descrisse anche, in un discorso unitario, le varianti della ὑπερηφανία.³⁰

2. Un frammento vecchio e uno nuovo

Filodemo cita ancora due volte la testimonianza di un Aristone in due passi rispettivamente del primo e del secondo libro del Περί κολακείας (*Sull'adulazione*): *PHerc.* 1457 fr. 23 e *PHerc.* 222 col. 10.5–10. In entrambi i casi, Filodemo non specifica, almeno nella porzione del testo conservata, l'origine geografica o l'appartenenza del filosofo a una

²⁵ Philippson (1938) 2468. Una intuizione ripresa e approfondita da Gigante (1996a) 131–2.

²⁶ **21a–g** = fr. 13 I–VII Wehrli.

²⁷ Wehrli (1968) 55.

²⁸ **21g–o** = fr. 14 I–IX Wehrli.

²⁹ Wehrli (1968) 59.

³⁰ Gigante (1999) 125.

determinata scuola né dà indicazioni relative all'opera nella quale ha recuperato quelle informazioni.

Il primo passo, già raccolto dal Wehrli,³¹ è conservato nella sezione finale del secondo libro³² dell'opera *Sull'adulazione*; lo precede, di qualche colonna, l'intero *Carattere 5* (ἀρέσκεια) di Teofrasto.³³ La revisione autoptica del papiro ha consentito qualche progresso.³⁴ Con Knögele e Wehrli limito il frammento alle sole linee 37–42. Quanto precede — difficile a ricostruire e di oscura interpretazione — non sembra contribuire alla comprensione del contesto in cui la citazione di Aristone si colloca (alla l. 28 è menzione dell'ἀρεσκευτικός, “piacenterè;” alle linee 35–6, Filodemo rinvia al suo scritto *Sulla bellezza e l'amore*, Περὶ κάλλους καὶ περὶ ἔρωτος).³⁵ La numerazione delle linee tiene conto della col. 11 che precede e che si collega al fr. 23 con l'intervallo di una linea.

Ὁ μέντοι φιλέ-
 παινος ὑπ' Ἀρίστωνος κα-
 λούμενος καὶ χαρακτηρι-
 40 ζό[μ]ενος οὗτ' εἰ συνήθ{ε} ἥ'ς ἐσ-
 τὶν οὗ[τ]ω διαφέρων οὐθ' ὁ-
 λως

La persona però che da Aristone è chiamata e caratterizzata come amante delle lodi (φιλέπαινος), nel caso che si tratti di un (termine) usuale, né differisce tanto dal piacerere (ἀρεσκευτικός) né insomma ...

Le lettere en di χαρακτηριζό[μ]ενος (39–40) si leggono chiaramente sul papiro; dell'o iniziale di οὗτ' resta una traccia in alto, sulla sinistra. Alla linea 40 si scorge una correzione interlineare: sopra l'ε di σύνηθες è aggiunto un η al fine di trasformare il neutro σύνηθες nel maschile συνήθ{ε} ἥ'ς. Non ostante la frammentarietà del testo e la lacuna dopo la l. 41, accetto, con la maggioranza degli editori, la correzione del neutro in maschile.³⁶ Alla linea 41, infine, penso che l'integrazione

³¹ 20 = fr. 15 Wehrli.

³² Capasso (1997) 149.

³³ Dorandi-Stein (1994) e Diggle (2004) 78–81, 222–49.

³⁴ Ringrazio sinceramente Anna Angeli che ha riletto l'originale su mia richiesta.

³⁵ L'intero passo è stato riedito anche dalla Kondo (1974) 53–4.

³⁶ Il neutro è conservato dal Bassi (1914) 17.

corretta sia οὐ[τ]ω proposto dal Crönert³⁷ (la traccia che segue la lacuna e precede διαφέρων si accorda piuttosto con un ω, che con un ε).

Per quanto concerne l'interpretazione del frammento, secondo il Crönert, Filodemo dopo avere descritto, sulla falsariga di Teofrasto, il carattere dell'ἄρεσκευτικός (piacentiere), rinuncia a quello del φιλέπαινος (amante delle lodi) per evitare una distinzione di caratteri troppo sottile. La posizione del Wehrli non si discosta molto da quella del Crönert.³⁸ Filodemo nega che l'ἄρεσκευτικός e il φιλέπαινος siano due caratteri diversi; il raro φιλέπαινος (*hapax*) è parola né συνήθης né διαφέρων ([ο]ὔτε συνήθης ἐστὶν οὐ[τε] διαφέρων οὐθ' οἱ[λως]).³⁹

Il secondo frammento, venuto alla luce dopo l'edizione del Wehrli, deriva dal primo libro della medesima opera,⁴⁰ divulgato dal Gargiulo.⁴¹ Filodemo critica Aristone per aver trascurato alcuni elementi e per non aver ben distinto la differenza fra imitare (τὸ μιμεῖσθαι) e emulare (τὸ ζηλοῦν) qualcuno. Ecco il testo del frammento nella ricostruzione di Gargiulo:⁴²

- 5 κ]αθάπερ Ἀρίστ[ω]ν ἔ-
 [φησεν, ἀλλ]ὰ μόνιόν ἐστι τῶν
 ὑπ' αὐτοῦ π]αραλελειμμέ[νω]ν,
 [ὅπερ διεσαφ]ήσαμέν ἡμε[ῖς]. ἄ]λ-
 [λο μὲν γὰρ] τὸ μιμεῖσθαί τ[ιν], ἔ-
 10 τερον δὲ] τὸ ζηλοῦν

... come disse Aristone, ma è una parte delle cose da lui tralasciate, come abbiamo chiarito noi. Una cosa è, infatti, l'imitare qualcuno, un'altra l'emularlo□... (trGargiulo).

³⁷ Crönert (1906/1965) 178.

³⁸ Wehrli (1968) 61–2.

³⁹ Cf. Acosta Méndez-Angeli (1992) 215 e Gigante (1999) 123–4.

⁴⁰ Angeli (1994) 76–7; Capasso (1998), in particolare 55 n. 29, e Capasso (2001) 181 n. 10.

⁴¹ Gargiulo (1981) 108, 110, 123–4.

⁴² Il papiro è perduto. Il testo è fondato sul disegno napoletano. Le linee che precedono e seguono la testimonianza su Aristone sono troppo frammentarie per dedurne qualcosa di concreto relativamente al contesto in cui essa si inseriva. Alle linee 2–3, si legge οἷησιν εἶναι τὴν [πρ]αοί[τητα πρὸς] τὸν κόλακα: “sembra che Filodemo critichi la condiscendenza verso il κόλαξ come indice di presunzione” Gargiulo (1981) 123.

Niente sembra opporsi alla possibilità che l'Aristone citato da Filodemo nel primo e nel secondo libro dell'opera *Sull'adulazione* sia identico a quello citato nel trattato *Sulla superbia*. Presupporre che entrambi i frammenti derivino da una medesima opera, il Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας, è ipotesi plausibile, anche se non dimostrabile.

3. Aristone di Ceo o Aristone di Chio?

Dopo avere gettato uno sguardo d'insieme sui frammenti di Aristone trasmessi da Filodemo, non resta che riprendere la delicata questione dell'identificazione di questo Aristone. Filodemo non si preoccupa, almeno nelle parti conservate dei suoi scritti, di specificare l'identità dell'Aristone oggetto delle sue critiche. Forse ne aveva citato l'etnico o esplicitata l'appartenenza a una determinata scuola filosofica in una parte oggi perduta, oppure riteneva che i suoi lettori erano sufficientemente edotti per dedurlo da soli.

Il contenzioso ha visto opposte due candidature: quella del peripatetico Aristone di Ceo e quella dello stoico Aristone di Chio. Passo rapidamente in rassegna i principali argomenti portati a favore dell'una e dell'altra tesi.⁴³

Una ἐπιστολή Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας non è mai attribuita dalle fonti antiche né a Aristone di Ceo né a Aristone di Chio. L'assegnazione stessa di singole opere all'uno o all'altro dei due filosofi aveva dato origine, fino dall'antichità, a dispute a causa anche della facile confusione fra gli etnici dei due Aristone (Χίος/Κεῖος). Diogene Laerzio⁴⁴ tramanda una lista di opere di Aristone di Chio, ma aggiunge che Panezio e Sosicrate ritenevano autentiche solo le *Epistole* e attribuivano i restanti scritti al Peripatetico di Ceo.⁴⁵ Fra le opere elencate da Diogene Laerzio, due in particolare, hanno attirato l'attenzione degli studiosi che si sono occupati della paternità del Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας: gli Ὑπομνήματα ὑπὲρ κενοδοξίας e i quattro libri delle *Epistole* (Ἐπιστολῶν δ').⁴⁶

⁴³ Mi limito a citare solo gli studi che hanno apportato qualcosa di nuovo al dibattito.

⁴⁴ D.L. 7.163. Aristo Chius SVF I fr. 346 = Aristo Ceus 8 = fr. 9 Wehrli.

⁴⁵ Uno *status quaestionis* in Ioppolo (1980) 39–55. Vedi anche Alesse (1997) 291–4.

⁴⁶ Con Gomperz (1888) 17 n. 14 e von Arnim, SVF I fr. 333 *ad loc.* (e con gli editori recenti di Diogene Laerzio) distingo le Ἐπιστολῶν δ' dal Πρὸς Κλεάνθην che precede.

L'*editor princeps* del libro filodemeo *Sulla superbia*, Luigi Caterino aveva attribuito gli estratti *Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας* a Aristone di Chio, a partire dalla sua improbabile integrazione di col. 16.34–5: *φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων [Χί]λος*, e aveva supposto una loro derivazione dagli *Ὑπομνήματα ὑπὲρ κενοδοξίας* o dai quattro libri delle *Ἐπιστολαί*.⁴⁷

Il primo a dichiararsi favorevole all'identità di Aristone con il filosofo peripatetico fu Hermann Sauppe.⁴⁸ Lo studioso rimpiazzò l'integrazione del Caterino con il palmare *φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων, ο[ῖ]λος*; prestò fede all'opinione di Panezio e di Sosicrate circa l'autenticità degli scritti di Aristone di Chio; condivise la proposta di identificare il *Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας* con gli *Ὑπομνήματα ὑπὲρ κενοδοξίας*; mise in evidenza strette somiglianze fra le pagine di Aristone e i *Caratteri* di Teofrasto, tali da fare supporre una imitazione da parte di Aristone; sottolineò il fatto che nell'antichità, almeno fino a Posidonio, la caratteriologia fu un genere letterario prevalentemente coltivato dai Peripatetici.

Christian Jensen addusse due nuovi argomenti a favore della paternità peripatetica dell'opera di Aristone:⁴⁹ l'aneddoto di Lisandro e Agesilao (col. 15.8–12) era citato, come si legge in Plutarco,⁵⁰ nello scritto antiretorico di un Aristone, che Mayer aveva identificato con il filosofo di Ceo;⁵¹ Filodemo, in un libro del *De adulatione* (*PHerc.* 1457), riporta per intero il *Carattere* 5 di Teofrasto e nel medesimo libro riproduce un'altra testimonianza sul carattere del *φιλέπαινος* descritto da un Aristone, sicuramente il Peripatetico.⁵²

Strette affinità di stile e di contenuto, ma anche differenze, con i *Caratteri* di Teofrasto mise in rilievo il Pasquali,⁵³ anch'egli favorevole all'identificazione dell'Aristone con il filosofo di Ceo. "Aristone si compiace, come Teofrasto, di allineare vizi affini per distinguerli poi in

⁴⁷ Caterino (1827) 20.

⁴⁸ Sauppe (1853) 6–9.

⁴⁹ Jensen (1911b).

⁵⁰ Plut., *Praec. ger. reipubl.* 804C–E. Il passo di Plutarco è raccolto dal Wehrli come fr. 25 di Aristone peripatetico (= **27**) e dal von Arnim, *SVF* I fr. 402 fra i frammenti di Aristone stoico. Sul problema dell'attribuzione, vedi la nota *ad loc.* nella nostra edizione dei frammenti.

⁵¹ Jensen (1911b) 403–4.

⁵² Jensen (1911b) 405–6. Vedi *supra*, n. 33.

⁵³ Pasquali (1918/1986) 59–62.

sottili definizioni . . . Ma, poiché distinzioni così fini non possono risaltare abbastanza dalla definizione nuda e cruda, Aristone si giova del privilegio che gli procura lo scrivere un trattato di morale, e non, come Teofrasto, una serie di schizzi staccati; e quindi, dopo avere tracciati alcuni caratteri tra loro simili, ne discute di nuovo più per disteso le qualità comuni e quelle specifiche. . . . In Aristone la definizione (non) manca mai; quantunque, a differenza di Teofrasto, sia definito soltanto il vizioso, e non il vizio” (59). Anche lo stile dei *Caratteri* di Aristone non differisce da quello di Teofrasto; quello che distingue i due autori è piuttosto la diversità di intenti e la maniera di affrontare la materia.

Augusto Rostagni⁵⁴ e soprattutto Carlo Gallavotti⁵⁵ riproposero la tesi stoica. Rostagni insisteva, contro Sauppe, sul fatto che il *Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας* di Aristone era una epistola (egli leggeva in col. 10.12–13 ἐπι[στ]ολήν con Jensen 1911ab), e che le *Epistole* erano la sola opera che Panezio e Sosicrate conservavano allo stoico; invitava inoltre a non considerare “la tradizione della scuola e l’analogia con Teofrasto” come un “argomento perentorio” a favore dell’attribuzione dell’opera a un autore peripatetico.⁵⁶

Per Gallavotti la differenza fra il testo di Aristone e i *Caratteri* di Teofrasto è grande e gli intenti che i due autori si sono proposti assai diversi: “Aristone fa opera essenzialmente morale; i pochi tratti foggianti alla maniera di Teofrasto . . . restano come oppressi nel gran numero di osservazioni morali che si riportano a ciascun carattere e che dipendono sempre da quell’unica tesi generale; come e quanto possa nuocere al vizioso il suo vizio” (471). Quanto alla questione dell’identità dell’Aristone, Gallavotti insiste sul fatto che il suo scritto era in forma di lettera (473) e sostiene che “nulla a prima vista ci vieta di identificare lo scritto riportato da Filodemo con una delle lettere a Cleante” (474). Uno studio del contenuto delle pagine di Aristone consente di individuare non solo tutta una serie di elementi e concetti stoici (474–7), ma anche sostanziali diversità dai precetti dell’etica peripatetica (478). Gli esempi storici citati nelle col. 11–16, infine, sono dislocati cronologicamente da Serse fino a Demetrio Poliorcete e a Pirro, cioè fino al tempo dell’Aristone di Chio, “mentre se l’autore della lettera

⁵⁴ Rostagni (1920) 440–3 = (1955) 351–5.

⁵⁵ Gallavotti (1927) e (1933) 31.

⁵⁶ Rostagni (1920) 441 n. 1 = (1955) 352 n. 1.

fosse il Peripatetico, probabilmente questo si sarebbe servito anche di esempi più recenti” (478).⁵⁷

L’origine peripatetica venne ribadita, qualche anno più tardi, dal Jensen.⁵⁸ Nella prima parte dell’estratto, Aristone “vuole aiutare i suoi simili, ma senza dare l’impressione di ritenersi migliore o più saggio di loro;” si pone pertanto “nello stato di chi è vittima della passione, e descrive gli esercizi spirituali con cui cerca di mitigarla;” il suo stile è quello della diatriba. Nella seconda parte, Aristone delinea “i diversi aspetti del superbo con una potenza di rappresentazione, quale si trova solo in Teofrasto.” In questa descrizione “osserviamo la rappresentazione dei caratteri posta al servizio della parenesi morale” in una “forma, cui siamo avvezzi dalla filosofia popolare greca” (22–3).

Lo studio fondamentale sulla questione resta comunque quello di Wilhelm Knögel: *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem*. Knögel, nell’orma delle ricerche del suo maestro Jensen, e sul fondamento di una nuova ricostruzione della col. 10 del *PHerc.* 1008, si proponeva di dimostrare, in maniera definitiva, l’appartenenza al Peripato dell’Aristone autore del *Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας*. Lo studioso accettava, alle linee 12–13 della col. 10, la nuova lettura ἐπιτο[μὴν] proposta da Jensen⁵⁹ in luogo di ἐπι[στ]ολ[ήν] e ne deduceva, di conseguenza, che quello scritto era una epitome e non una lettera. Questa nuova lezione, confermata dalla presenza del verbo ἐπιτομέω alle linee 28–9 della medesima colonna (ἐπετέλεμετο) gli consentiva di eliminare una delle maggiori obiezioni fra quelle che erano state sollevate contro la tesi peripatetica: se il trattato di Aristone era una ἐπιτομή e non una ἐπιστολή la sua attribuzione a Aristone di Chio, basata in larga misura sull’ammissione che costui aveva scritto una raccolta di Ἐπιστολαί, viene a cadere. A partire da questa congettura e da una nuova ricostruzione delle linee 13–15 della col. 10 — (Ἀρίστων) ... τὸ ἴδιον μὲν ἔπαθεν [τῶν] διὰ τύχην ὑπ[ε]ρληφ[ά]-νων [σοφ]ῶν —, Knögel giungeva ai seguenti risultati: 1) lo scritto di Aristone era una epitome; 2) l’autore aveva sperimentato lui stesso le conseguenze della superbia; 3) lo scritto aveva come oggetto la superbia dei σοφοί (9).

⁵⁷ Sull’ipotesi del Gallavotti (e sulla replica di Knögel), vedi Angeli (2003) 309–15.

⁵⁸ Jensen (1930) 57–9 = (1979) 21–3.

⁵⁹ Jensen (1930) 57–8 n. 11 = (1979) 21 n. 11.

In una prima parte della sua dissertazione (9–16), lo studioso si impegna a giustificare e a difendere i risultati appena elencati.⁶⁰ Nella seconda parte (17–47), esamina con cura dapprima (17–40) i *Caratteri* di Aristone nei loro rapporti con l'etica peripatetica, in un serrato confronto con l'*Etica Nicomachea* di Aristotele e con i *Caratteri* di Teofrasto; in seguito (40–7), attacca le posizioni di Gallavotti e indica un elemento in aperto contrasto con la dottrina stoica dell'impassibilità del saggio davanti alle vicissitudini della sorte nel fatto che Aristone discuteva nel suo scritto della superbia dei sapienti causata dalla fortuna. Nella terza parte della dissertazione (48–78), Knögel analizza con pazienza e rigore lo stile e la lingua degli estratti di Aristone prendendo a modello il giudizio sullo stile di Aristone che leggiamo in Cicerone.⁶¹ La conclusione è che l'autore della *Epitome* non può essere che il filosofo di Ceo. In un breve *excursus* (75–8), Knögel si sofferma sui frammenti biografici di Aristone e mette in evidenza alcuni punti di contatto fra la descrizione del carattere dell'ἀσθένεια nell'*Epitome* e le osservazioni sulla ὑπερηφάνια di Eraclito che leggiamo in Diogene Laerzio (9.3–5). La fonte di Diogene era il Περὶ Ἡρακλείτου di Aristone di Ceo.⁶² La dissertazione è completata da una Appendice (79–94) nella quale Knögel pubblica una raccolta delle testimonianze e dei frammenti del filosofo con l'esclusione dei resti dell'*Epitome*, per la quale presupponeva l'edizione di Jensen (corretta in qualche singolo punto: 94).

La pubblicazione della dissertazione di Knögel, i cui risultati vennero interinati dal Wehrli nella sua edizione dei frammenti di Aristone di Ceo, sembrava aver messo un punto fermo al dibattito. Sennonché, Anna Maria Ioppolo ha recentemente individuato almeno un elemento originale in difesa della tesi stoica.⁶³ La studiosa considera le colonne 10 e 21–3 del *PHerc.* 1008 (ritratto dell'εἴρων). La descrizione dell'εἴρων-Socrate delineato da Aristone mostra indiscutibili divergenze dalla caratterizzazione dell'uomo ironico che leggiamo nell'*Etica Nicomachea* di Aristotele e nei *Caratteri* di Teofrasto (721–3). Riprendendo una osservazione di Rostagni, la Ioppolo ribadisce che

⁶⁰ L'arbitrarietà della ricostruzione del testo proposta da Knögel è rilevata da Gallavotti (1933). Anche Philippon (1934) 1330 dubita della integrazione ἐπιτομήν.

⁶¹ Cic., *De fin.* 5.13 = 5 = fr. 10 Wehrli.

⁶² La questione è stata di nuovo dibattuta da Gigante (1996b), passando sotto silenzio il contributo di Knögel (1933).

⁶³ Ioppolo (1996).

“non sono sufficienti la tradizione della scuola e l’analogia con Teofrasto a stabilire che l’autore debba essere un Peripatetico” (723). Aristone ci trasmette una immagine negativa dell’εἴρων-Socrate, ben diversa da quella propria agli Academici e ai Peripatetici e più vicina alla tradizione antisocratica degli Epicurei in opposizione a Arcesilao; Aristone non attacca il Socrate storico, ma una interpretazione della filosofia di Socrate — che è quella di Arcesilao —, “che vede nella dissimulazione di ignoranza l’aspetto qualificante della sua ironia” (729–30). Aristone sembra abbia scritto il suo ritratto di Socrate in maniera che il lettore potesse capire immediatamente che il bersaglio della sua polemica era Arcesilao. Inoltre, nella descrizione del Socrate-εἴρων come un arrogante che ama anche ὑποκιναιδεῖν, “parlare in modo indecente”⁶⁴ è possibile scoprire un’allusione alle critiche che, secondo Diogene Laerzio (4.40–1), Aristone di Chio aveva mosso contro Arcesilao definendolo κιναιδολόγον καὶ θρασύν, “un arrogante che dice sconcezze” (come intende la Ioppolo). “Se è possibile accostare da un punto di vista semantico il verbo ὑποκιναιδεῖν alla parola κιναιδολόγος, allora acquisiamo un altro elemento a sostegno dell’ipotesi che l’autore del ritratto dell’εἴρων possa essere Aristone di Chio” (731). Il Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας va forse identificato con una delle lettere che Aristone di Chio aveva indirizzate al suo maestro Cleante e nella quale utilizzava una parte degli Ὑπομνήματα ὑπὲρ κενοδοξίας, quelli dedicati appunto alla descrizione della superbia. Questa ipotesi confermerebbe — conclude la studiosa — l’intuizione del Wehrli che Filodemo ebbe ricorso a due distinte opere di Aristone, l’una dedicata alla cura del vizio della superbia, l’altra a una descrizione dei tipi di superbo.

La tesi dell’identificazione di Aristone con il filosofo peripatetico è stata infine ribadita, senza troppa originalità, da Gigante in una serie di contributi riassunti nel volume *Kepos e Peripatos*.⁶⁵ A parte qualche intervento testuale (in particolare la lettura ἐπιστολικά) e esegetico (corretto rifiuto dell’ipotesi della doppia fonte prospettata da Wehrli) non trascurabili, per il resto, l’autore si limita spesso a una rimasticatura del commento del Wehrli. Le stesse obiezioni mosse all’ipotesi

⁶⁴ Così traduce il verbo la Ioppolo (1996) 730. Gli altri traduttori hanno fatto scelte differenti: “fare il volpone” Acosta Méndez-Angeli (1992) 184; “to talk mincingly” Rusten (1993) 195; “atteggiarsi a cinedo” Gigante (1999) 133.

⁶⁵ Gigante (1999) 123–33.

giudicata “unilaterale” della Ioppolo restano nel vago: “Noi preferiamo rimanere nel Peripato, ribadendo col Gomperz, il legame del libro aristoneo con i *Caratteri* di Teofrasto.”⁶⁶

All’inizio del mio contributo, non esitavo a dichiarare di non essere riuscito a trovare né una nuova via di ricerca né nuovi argomenti a favore o contro l’attribuzione del Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας al filosofo di Ceo o a quello di Chio. Alla fine, vorrei essere meno pessimista e invitare il futuro editore dei frammenti di Aristone di Ceo a riflettere su un paio di frasi di Pasquali. Forse è proprio in esse che si cela una via di ricerca non ancora sufficientemente battuta:⁶⁷

‘È dunque Aristone una scimmia teofrastea e nulla più? Oserei negarlo con ogni energia. A me pare che questi *Caratteri*, nonostante le somiglianze essenziali e formali, siano più seri e universali. . . . Questa maggiore universalità, d’altro canto, è come scontata da un certo difetto di comicità. . . . Noi sentiamo che come nei *Caratteri* di Lycone e di Satyro, così in quelli di Aristone, benché molto diversamente e senza offesa del buon gusto, l’equilibrio è rotto. Aristone maneggia con certa pesantezza una forma d’arte inventata da un maestro — Teofrasto — ma con tutto ciò pochissimo atta a esser trattata da professori che non siano artisti.’

Bibliografia

- Acosta Méndez, E. e Angeli, A. 1992. *Filodemo, Testimonianze su Socrate* (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
- Alesse, F. 1997. *Panezio di Rodi. Testimonianze* (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
- Angeli, A. 1994. “Lo svolgimento dei papiri carbonizzati,” in *Il rotolo librario: Fabbricazione, restauro, organizzazione interna*, ed. M. Capasso = *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 3: 37–104.
- — —. 2003. “Carlo Gallavotti e la Papirologia Ercolanese,” in *Contributi alla storia dell’Officina dei Papiri Ercolanesi*, vol. 3, ed. M. Capasso (Napoli: Graus), 301–90.
- Bassi, D. 1914. *Herculaneum Voluminum quae supersunt. Collectio tertia*, vol. 1 (Milano: Hoepli).
- Capasso, M. 1983. “Epicureismo e Eraclito. Contributo alla ricostruzione della critica epicurea alla filosofia presocratica,” in

⁶⁶ Gigante (1997a) 154.

⁶⁷ Pasquali (1918/1986) 61–2.

- Atti del Symposium Heracliteum 1981*, vol. 1, ed. L. Rossetti (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo), 451–4.
- — —. 1997. “I titoli nei papiri ercolanesi. II: Il primo esempio di un titolo iniziale in un papiro Ercolanese (*PHerc.* 1457),” in *Akten 21. Internat. Papyrologenkongr.* (Stuttgart/Leipzig: Teubner), 146–54.
- — —. 1998. “I titoli nei papiri ercolanesi. IV: Altri tre esempi di titoli iniziali,” in Id. (ed.), *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 7: 54–9.
- — —. 2001. “Les livres sur la flatterie dans les *De vitiis* de Philodème,” in *Cicéron et Philodème. La polémique en philosophie*, ed. C. Auvray-Assayas e D. Delattre (Paris: Éditions rue d’Ulm), 179–94.
- Caterino, L. 1827. *Herculaneusium Voluminum quae supersunt, Collectio prior* 3 (Neapoli).
- Crönert, W. 1906/1965. *Kolotes und Menedemos* (Leipzig: Avenarius; rist. anast. Amsterdam: Hakkert).
- Diggle, J. 2004. *Theophrastus Characters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University).
- Dodds, E. R. 1959. *Plato, Gorgias* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Dorandi, T. e Stein, M. 1994. “Der älteste Textzeuge für den ἄρεσκος des Theophrast,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 100: 1–16.
- Gallavotti, C. 1927. “Teofrasto e Aristone (Per la genesi dei *Caratteri* teofrastei),” *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 55: 468–79.
- — —. 1933. Rec. di Knögel (1933). *Bollettino di Filologia Classica* 40: 29–33.
- Gargiulo, T. 1981. “*PHerc.* 222: Filodemo Sull’adulazione,” *Cronache Ercolanesi* 11: 103–27.
- Gigante, M. 1996a. “Atakta,” *Cronache Ercolanesi* 26: 131–2 = Gigante (2002) 118–23.
- — —. 1996b. “Aristone di Ceo biografo dei filosofi,” *Studi Classici e Orientali* 46: 17–23.
- — —. 1997a. “Atakta,” *Cronache Ercolanesi* 27: 153–4 = Gigante (2002) 115–18.
- — —. 1997b. “I sette tipi dell’archetipo ‘il superbo’ in Aristone di Ceo,” in *Synodia A. Garzya* (Napoli: D’Auria), 345–56.
- — —. 1998. “Atakta,” *Cronache Ercolanesi* 28: 112 = Gigante (2002) 114–15.

- — —. 1999. *Kepos e Peripatos. Contributo allo studio dell' aristotelismo antico* (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
- — —. 2002. *Atakta 2* (Napoli: Macchiaroli).
- Gomperz, T. 1888. "Über die Charaktere Theophrast's," *Sitzungsberichte Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften*, philos.-hist. Kl. 117.10.
- Indelli, G. 2001. "Per una nuova edizione del *PHerc.* 1008 (Filodemo, *I vizi*, libro X)," in *Atti XXII Congr. Internaz. Papirologia* (Firenze: Istituto Papirologico "G. Vitelli"), 693–8.
- — —. 2003. "Noterelle ercolanesi," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 33: 319–22.
- Ioppolo, A.M. 1980. *Aristone di Chio e lo Stoicismo antico* (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
- — —. 1996. "Ἡ Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας: una polemica antiscettica in Filodemo?," in *Epicureismo greco e romano*, ed. G. Giannantoni e M. Gigante (Napoli: Bibliopolis), 715–34.
- Jensen, C. 1911a. *Philodemi Περὶ κακίων liber X* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- — —. 1911b. "Ariston von Keos bei Philodem," *Hermes* 46: 393–406.
- — —. 1930/1979. "Die Bibliothek von Herculaneum," *Bonner Jahrbücher* 135: 49–61. Traduzione italiana in C. Jensen, M. Gigante, W. Schmid, *Saggi di papirologia ercolanese* (Napoli: Morano), 11–26 (da cui cito).
- Knögel, W. 1933. *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz).
- Kondo, E. 1974. "Per l'interpretazione del pensiero filodemeo sulla adulazione nel *PHerc.* 1457," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 4: 43–56.
- Mouraviev, S. 1987. "La Vie d'Héraclite de Diogène Laërce. Analyse stratigraphique—Le texte de base—Un nouveau fragment d'Ariston de Céos?," *Phronesis* 32: 1–33.
- — —. 1999. *Heraclitea 2.A.1 Traditio (A)* (Sankt Augustin: Akademie).
- Pasquali, G. 1918/1986. "Sui Caratteri di Teofrasto," *Rassegna italiana di lingue e letterature classiche* 1: 1–35 = Id., *Scritti Filologici* (Firenze: Olschki), 47–96 (da cui cito).
- Philippson, R. 1934. Rec. di Knögel (1933), *Philologische Wochenschrift* 54: 1329–34.

- — —. 1938. "Philodemos," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 19.2: 2444–82.
- Ranocchia, G. 2001. "Filodemo e il Περί τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας. Contributo a una nuova edizione del *PHerc.* 1008," in M. Capasso (ed.), *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 10: 231–63.
- Rostagni, A. 1920/1955. "Sui *Caratteri* di Teofrasto," *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 48: 417–43 = Id., *Scritti minori I: Aesthetica* (Torino: Bottega d'Erasmus), 327–55.
- Rusten, J. 1993. *Theophrastus, Characters. Herodas, Mimes. Cercidas and the Choliambic Poets*, ed. J. Rusten, I. C. Cunningham, A. D. Knox (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University).
- Sauppe, H. 1853. "Philodemi de vitiis liber decimus," *Jahresbericht über das Wilhelm-Ernstische Gymnasium zu Weimar von Ostern 1849 bis Ostern 1853* (Weimar: Albrecht'schen priv. Hof-Buchdruckerei).
- Wehrli, F. 1968². *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 6: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (Basel/Stuttgart: Schwabe).

4

L'Autore del Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας: Un problema riaperto

Graziano Ranocchia

1. La forma epistolare dello scritto

Da quando, nel 1933, lo studioso tedesco W. Knögel pubblicò la sua dissertazione sullo scritto Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας (*Sul modo in cui alleggerire dalla superbia*) ampiamente parafrasato da Filodemo nel decimo libro della sua opera *Sui Vizi* (*PHerc.* 1008), ascrivendolo al peripatetico Aristone di Ceo, gli studiosi ritennero praticamente concluso l'annoso problema dell'attribuzione. Filodemo, infatti, presentando l'ampio estratto, lo assegna a un non meglio precisato Aristone, nel quale alcuni studiosi avevano voluto riconoscere lo stoico 'dissidente' Aristone di Chio, altri il Peripatetico di Ceo.¹ Fondamentale, a tale proposito, è l'esegesi della col. 10 del *PHerc.* 1008, che è stata

¹ Si conoscono almeno quattordici differenti filosofi con questo nome; vedi Goulet (1989–) A 386–99. Tuttavia i numerosi riferimenti ad eventi e personaggi storici rilevabili nel Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ., tutti collocabili tra 5 e 4 secolo a.C. e comunque mai successivi al primo venticinquennio del 3 secolo a.C., restringono il campo della possibile scelta ad Aristone di Ceo (nato prima del 250 a.C.) ed Aristone di Chio (ancora vivo dopo il 255 a.C.), gli altri essendo vissuti tutti in epoche in genere notevolmente seriori e comunque mai prima dei secoli 2/1 a.C.

oggetto, nel tempo, di una molteplicità di letture ed interpretazioni. Siffatti motivi mi hanno indotto ad effettuare una nuova autopsia tanto della col. 10 quanto, per altri motivi, delle coll. 21–3, i cui risultati sono raccolti in altra sede.² Riporto di seguito l'estratto della col. 10 che ci interessa più da vicino, cioè l'introduzione di Filodemo alla lunga parafrasi aristonea (Il. 10–30), secondo la mia edizione:³

- 10 Ἀρίστων
το[ί]νυν [γ]εγραφὸς περὶ τοῦ
κο[υ]φίξε[ι]ν [ύ]περηφανίας ἐ-
πιστολικά τ[ὸ] ἴδιον μὲν ἔ-
παθεν [τῶ]ν δ[ι]ὰ τύχην ὑπ[ε]ρ-
15 ηφ[ά]νων [έ]τ[ι] αἰ[ρ]ων, οὐ μό-
νο[v] διὰ τ[ὰ] ὑπ[ὲρ] τούτης ὑπερ-
ηφ[α]νού[ντων], ἀλλὰ καὶ
δι' ἃ προείπ[α]μεν ἡμεῖς καὶ
δῆ[τ]α καὶ δι' αὐτὴν <τὴν> φιλοσο-
20 φί[αν] πολλῶν δοξάντων,
ὥς [Ἡ]ρακλείτου καὶ Πυθαγό-
ρου καὶ Ἑ[μ]πεδοκλέους καὶ
Σωκράτους καὶ ποιητῶν ἐνί-
ων, οὓς ο[ί]τι παλαιοὶ τῶν κω-
25 μῶιδोगράφων ἐπεράπιζον.
ἀλλ' ὅμως, εἴ τινα πείσει, κ[α]-
θάπ[ερ] οὐκ ἂν ἀπεοικ(ό)τως τι-
νὰ πε[ί]σειεν περὶ ὧν ἀπετέ-
μετο, κεφαλαιώσομαι τὰς
30 δυνάμεις αὐτῶν.

11 γρ lineae inferiores tantum Π, utraque etiam ι, κ, ν, π, τ, υ α lineae dextrorsum descendens, λ, χ, μ 12 ο tergum et ε, θ, σ, ω Π ε[ι] tergi vestigium vel σ υ lineae dextrae lineaeque laevae vestigia vel η vel π π ON: π Π 12–13 ἐπιστολικά legit Gigante, ε Ν: ε Π, tum π ON: π Π, σ vestigia partis inferioris vel ε Π ι caput, sed et γ, η, ι, ν, π, ρ, tum vestigium lineae aliquantum dextrorsum ascendens, forsitan κ vel γ, η, ι, ν, π, ρ Π, ἐπιστολήν J.¹: ἐπιτομήν con. J.², quem secutus est W. 13 sq. ἔπαθεν disp. J.¹, ἐπ O: ἐπ OΠ, ε pars inferior et capitis exigua vestigia vel ο vel θ vel σ Π: contra vestigia papyri item ἐβλεπεν conn. R. et W., sicut ἔγραφεν con. M. 15 [έ]τ[ι] αἰ[ρ]ων legi necnon supplēvi, α pes dext. transtrique vestigium vel η Π: [θη]γῶν

² Ranocchia (2001).

³ Il testo, l'apparato e la traduzione sono stati modificati in più punti rispetto al mio articolo del 2001. Tutte le citazioni testuali, ad esclusione di quelle relative alle coll. 10 e 21–23, si riferiscono all'edizione di Jensen (1911a). Per il nuovo testo critico delle coll. 10–24 del *PHerc.* 1008 si veda ora Ranocchia (2005).

(μόνον) spatio brevius suppl. J.¹ (μόνον) add. Sudhaus), qui deinceps [σοφ]ῶν apud Knögel: eodem modo [μόν]ων suppll. W. et Capasso, [άνδρ]ῶν M., [όντ]ων A.-A. ων¹ 1ου 15 sq. <μόνον>. Οὐ μόλνο[ν] interpunx. J.¹: [σοφ]ῶν — οὐ μόλνο[ν] Knögel: [άνδρ]ῶν, οὐ μόλνο[ν] M. [όντ]ων· οὐ μόλνο[ν] A.-A. 16 διὰ τ[ᾶ] π[ρὸ] supplementi, δια N:]ια O: δ[.]α Π, tum τ[ᾶ] lineae inferior lineaeque superioris vestigium vel π,]ο O:]ο N: [Π]: δ[ι]ὰ τ[ᾶ] π[ρὸ] W.: δ[ι]ὰ τ[ᾶ] π[ρὸ] S.: δ' ἄ[π'] α[ὐτῆς] J.¹: δ[ι]ὰ τ[ᾶ] π[ρὸ] Kn.: διὰ τ[ᾶ] π[ρὸ] Gigante apud Capasso 17 η, ON: η, Π 18 ἀπρ ON: ἀπρ Π, tum ε transtri apex, etiamve ξ Π, tum π lineae laevae exigua vestigia, β, γ, η, ι, κ, ν, ρ, τ, προεἴπαμεν disp. J.¹ 19]α lineae dextrorsum descendentes pars extrema vel δ vel μ vel χ Π, δη[τα] suppl. G. καιδι O: κ[.]ιδι N:]δι Π 21 ρ lineae inferioris vestigium, β, γ, η, ι, κ, ν, π Π ακ[.]ει O:]ακλε[N:]κλε. Π 22 αιε ON: α[.]ε Π 24 init.v lineae laevae vestigia, β, γ, η, ι, κ, π, ρ Π ο[ON: [Π] 25 δ ὈΝ: δ Π γρ N: γρ Π ραπι ON:]πι Π 26 sq. κ[α]θ[ά]π[ερ] suppl. J.¹, κ ON: κ Π 27 fin. ι ON: [Π] 28 να O, .α N: [Π] πείσειεν disp. J.¹: πε[.]ειεν O: π[.]σειεν N: ..[.]σ[.]εν Π fin. ν ON: ν Π 28 sq. ἀπετεμετο N: ἀπετεμετε O: ἀπετεμετο Π, o partis inferioris vestigium vel θ vel σ Π: contra vestigia papyri item [πρὸ]ε[ί]λετο con. J.¹, sicut ἐξείλετο/ ἐφείλετο con. Gigante: ἐπετέμετο Kn. 29 αἰτ ON: αἰτ Π 30 δυν, εἰς ON: .υν, ε[.]σ Π

Aristone, dunque, pur avendo scritto un'opera epistolare *Sul modo in cui alleggerire dalla superbia*, patì ciò che fu proprio dei compagni divenuti superbi a causa della fortuna, i quali andavano superbi non soltanto per le congiunture prodotte da questa, ma anche per quei motivi che prima abbiamo detto noi e certo molti sembrano esserlo diventati anche a causa della stessa filosofia, come Eraclito, Pitagora, Empedocle, Socrate e taluni poeti, che i commediografi più antichi colpirono. Ma ugualmente, nel caso dovesse persuadere qualcuno, così come non inverosimilmente potrebbe convincere qualcuno sugli argomenti che si è riservato, ne ricapiterò il contenuto.

Come è noto, è stato considerato un punto cruciale per l'attribuzione del Περί τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ. la possibilità di inquadrare lo scritto come un epistola (od opera epistolare) o di negare, invece, tale eventualità. In effetti, come già facevano notare A. Rostagni, C. Gallavotti e, recentemente, A. M. Ioppolo,⁴ è proprio una raccolta di epistole in quattro libri (Ἐπιστολῶν δ'), l'unica opera risparmiata dall'atetesi di Panezio e Sosicrate tra quelle che Diogene Laerzio attribuisce al filosofo stoico, mentre di una produzione epistolare del Peripatetico non sappiamo assolutamente nulla, anche se non è impossibile che ne avesse una. Ebbene, già L. Caterini, nella 'protoedizione' napoletana del 1827,⁵ esibiva, a col. 10.12–13, la lezione ἐπι[στ]ολ[ι]μαίων βιβλίον,

⁴ Rostagni (1920) 441 n. 1; Gallavotti (1927) 473–4; Ioppolo (1996) 716 n. 4.

⁵ Caterini (1827) 1–54.

persuadendosi, dunque, che l'Aristone autore del Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ. fosse lo Stoico. Sulla stessa linea si ponevano A. Krisch e N. Saal, che con gli stessi argomenti si espressero a favore dello Stoico.⁶

Il primo a mettere in discussione il carattere epistolare dello scritto fu H. Sauppe, il quale dopo aver sostituito la lettura ἐπι[στ]ολ[ιμαῖον, con la forma ἐπὶ τὸ π]ολ[ύ, ravvisò tra lo scritto aristoneo e i *Caratteri* di Teofrasto una somiglianza *et formae et totius rationis*, che deve essere considerata frutto di imitazione.⁷ Il discepolo di Aristotele fu infatti l'*inventor* di un genere di cui, almeno fino a Posidonio, saranno cultori privilegiati proprio i Peripatetici, da sempre attenti alla descrizione tanto della natura fisica quanto della vita umana sociale e privata. Alle riserve espresse da R. Heinze⁸ e da A. Mayer⁹ si deve aggiungere che la forma ἐπὶ τὸ π]ολ[ύ risulta incompatibile tanto con la lezione del papiro, quanto con quella degli apografi. Non si deve dimenticare, infatti, che Sauppe non vide mai il papiro, avendo a disposizione esclusivamente il testo dell'“edizione” napoletana del Caterini, da lui liberamente integrato.

Sarà necessaria l'autopsia di Jensen, all'inizio del Novecento, per provare l'infondatezza della lettura del suo predecessore. Nell'edizione pubblicata da tale studioso nel 1911, infatti (l'unica edizione complessiva del *PHerc.* 1008 di cui attualmente disponiamo), alla col. 10.12–13, si evince la forma ἐπιστολ[ήν, che è decisamente aderente sia alla lezione del papiro che a quella degli apografi.¹⁰ Senonché lo studioso tedesco non sembra avvedersi dell'importanza di una tale lettura, ma al contrario si dice sicuro dell'attribuzione al Peripatetico. Egli adduce ad esile prova il fatto che il *PHerc.* 1457 *De adulatione*, appartenente anch'esso al trattato *De Vitiis* e che riporta una citazione letterale del capitolo dei *Caratteri* teofrastei dedicato all'ἄρεσκέια, menzioni alla col. 11.23 il nome di un Aristone a cui si attribuisce una

⁶ Krisch (1840) 408; Saal (1852) 17.

⁷ Sauppe (1849–53) 6–7.

⁸ Heinze (1890) 511 n. 1: “Ich will nur bemerken, daß wir dem Stoiker, der Bion dem Theophrasteer sehr nahe stand, recht wohl Charakterismen zutrauen dürfen.”

⁹ Mayer (1907–10) 487: “Noch zweifelhafter ist die Combination Sauppes [...], der den von Philodem in diesem Buche zweimal (§§10 und 23) genannten Ariston als den Peripatetiker und Verfasser der im Diogenes-Katalog genannten ὑπομνήματα ὑπὲρ κενοδοξίας ansehen wollte: denn daß der bei Philodem Genannte Charakterschilderungen schrieb, genügt noch nicht, um den Stoiker auszuschließen.”

¹⁰ Jensen (1911a) 16 ed *infra* 1.

descrizione del φιλέπαινος che non ci è pervenuta e che lo studioso identifica con l'autore del nostro estratto. Ulteriore indizio sarebbe costituito dalla constatazione che l'aneddoto di Lisandro ed Agesilao che si legge nel *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.* a col. 15.8–12 è da Plutarco (*Praec. ger. reipubl.* 804E) attribuito all'Aristone autore di quel *Πρὸς τοὺς ῥήτορας* che Mayer aveva negato allo Stoico sulla base di argomentazioni ora superate.¹¹

Il parere di Jensen, trovò forti resistenze in A. Rostagni¹² e C. Gallavotti il quale, dopo aver sottolineato l'inconsistenza degli argomenti di quello, giudicati “quanto mai arbitrari e infondati,” ribadì che per la soluzione della controversia la forma epistolare dello scritto è decisiva per l'attribuzione ad Aristone di Chio.¹³ Ma, come si è detto, ad imprimere una svolta fondamentale alla storia della controversia fu la dissertazione pubblicata nel 1933 da W. Knögel che, sbarazzandosi dell'ingombrante lezione ἐπιστολ[ήν e sostituendola con la forma ἐπι[τ]ομ[ήν, la *nova lectio* avanzata in un secondo momento dello stesso Jensen,¹⁴ tolse di mezzo quello che era stato considerato uno dei più pesanti argomenti a favore dell'attribuzione allo Stoico. Il senso da attribuire al termine sarebbe, secondo Knögel, quello di “eine kurze Darstellung,” non un compendio, dunque, ma una concisa trattazione.¹⁵ A suggestionare lo studioso nel senso dell'ἐπιτομή ha contribuito anche la lettura, qualche linea più sotto (col. 10.28–9), di una supposta forma ἐπετέλετο (da ἐπιτέμνω), “ha sintetizzato.”

La replica di Gallavotti, nella recensione al lavoro di Knögel, consistette in una ferma denuncia dell'arbitrarietà con la quale quest'ultimo dava per scontata una forma che né lui né il suo maestro Jensen, che gliela aveva trasmessa, avevano scorto direttamente nel papiro, con l'aggravante di non aver mai fatto cenno, in tutto il corso del suo lavoro

¹¹ Mayer (1907–10) 547–604; cf. Jensen (1911b) 405–6. Per la discussione relativa, si veda Ioppolo (1980) 48–50. Si aggiunga che, come fa notare Gallavotti (1927) 472 n. 2, l'episodio di Lisandro ed Agesilao era assai divulgato ed è riferito anche da Senofonte, *Hell.* 3.4.9.

¹² Rostagni (1920) 440–1: “Il quale Aristone poi non è affatto stabilito che sia da identificare, come oggi si dà per certo — in grazia alla semplice imitazione di quei bozzetti dai *Caratteri* teofrastei — col Peripatetico, nativo di Ceo, e non piuttosto, come i testi vorrebbero, con lo Stoico-Cinico di Chio.”

¹³ Gallavotti (1927).

¹⁴ Jensen (1930) 21 n. 11; cf. Rieth (1936) 619.

¹⁵ Knögel (1933) 9–10.

(nemmeno nell'apparato critico) all'esistenza della precedente lezione ἐπιστολήν, tanto più quando si consideri che nel carattere epistolare dello scritto risiederebbe "il più grave argomento a favore dello Stoico."¹⁶ Lo studioso italiano osserva, inoltre, che il termine ἐπιτομή, anche quando possiede il significato che gli attribuisce lo studioso tedesco, rinvia sempre ad un compendio *tout court* condotto su un testo o su una materia preesistenti. Sta di fatto che, se si esclude il caso di Gallavotti, le due lezioni del Knögel, sono state accolte dalla comunità scientifica, praticamente senza eccezioni, fino ai giorni nostri, riscuotendo, tra gli altri, l'approvazione di O. Brink,¹⁷ F. Wehrli (che include il Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ. nella sua silloge, collocandolo tra i frammenti di Aristone di Ceo),¹⁸ K. Kleve,¹⁹ M. Capasso,²⁰ S. N. Mouraviev,²¹ e J. Rusten.²²

Ora, però, la forma ἐπι[τ]ομήν non si adatta né alle tracce del papiro, né a quelle degli apografi. Essa infatti:

- non tiene conto dell'arco inferiore del σ (o dell'ε) che costituisce la terza lettera della linea;
- identifica con un μ parti di due distinte lettere (il λ e la lettera successiva);
- ignora il fatto, constatabile nel papiro, che alla l. 13 la lacuna dopo ΠΙ è almeno di due lettere e non di una soltanto, come si sarebbe costretti a ritenere nel caso della lettura ἐπι[τ]ομήν.

La forma ἐπετέμμετο, poi (col. 10.28–9), risulta altrettanto infondata: di fatto nel papiro si riesce ancora a leggere la sommità di un α, l'asta orizzontale di un π (che in teoria potrebbe anche essere un τ), un ε, l'estremità inferiore e superiore destra di un τ, un ε, poi la metà destra di un μ (anche se teoricamente potrebbe pure trattarsi di un λ), un ε, un τ e, infine, l'arco inferiore di un ο. I disegni, poi, registrano απετεμμετο il napoletano ed απετεμμετε l'oxoniense. La lezione genuina è dunque

¹⁶ Gallavotti (1933) 32.

¹⁷ Brink (1940) 935.

¹⁸ Wehrli (1968).

¹⁹ Kleve (1986) 245: "Philodemus must refer to a certain Ariston from Ceos or some other Peripatetic philosopher."

²⁰ Capasso (1983).

²¹ Mouraviev (1987) 22–23.

²² Rusten (1993).

ἀπετέλμετο (da ἀποτέμνω, “tagliare, strappare via”), che nel nostro contesto acquista l’accezione mediale di “ritagliare per sé, riservarsi.” Il senso che ne risulta non è dunque “su quello che [Aristone] ha sintetizzato,” bensì “sugli argomenti che si è riservato,” vale a dire che Aristone ha riservato all’illustrazione della sua tesi e di cui si è avvalso come *medicamina* da propinare alla mente malata del superbo. Anche M. Gigante, che ha recentemente effettuato una nuova autopsia del papiro con la collaborazione di F. Longo Auricchio, G. Indelli, T. Di Matteo e G. Del Mastro, ha escluso categoricamente tanto la lettura ἐπι[τ]ομ[ήν] quanto la lezione ἐπετέλμετο.²³ Inoltre, afferma lo studioso italiano, “l’operazione di ἐπιτέμνειν non può essere attribuita a Aristone. L’epitome, vale a dire la ricapitolazione, una κεφαλαίωσις, è di Filodemo.”

Ma con tutto ciò quel che più conta è che, in tempi relativamente recenti, E. Acosta Méndez ed A. Angeli, effettuando una nuova autopsia della col. 10 (oltre che delle coll. 21–3) del nostro papiro con l’ausilio di strumenti ignoti a Jensen, hanno restaurato la primitiva lezione ἐπιστολ[ήν], ma ciò nonostante escludono dal commentario il benché minimo riferimento alla tormentata questione dell’attribuzione.²⁴ Sarà A.M. Ioppolo, in un recente articolo, a comprendere per prima la portata del ripristino di una tale lettura, rimarcando l’incidenza che essa può esercitare sulla questione dell’attribuzione.²⁵

Come se non bastasse M. Gigante, durante l’autopsia a cui si è già fatto cenno, ha letto, a l. 12–13, un ἐπιστολ[ι]κά, forma che anch’io ho potuto personalmente riscontrare nel papiro (ἐπιστολικά). In effetti alla fine della l. 12, dopo la parola [ύ]περηφανίας si legge distintamente un ε. All’inizio della linea successiva si osservano la parte inferiore di un’asta verticale sovrastata dall’estremità destra di un’asta orizzontale (probabilmente un π, ma non è escluso il τ), di seguito un nitido ι, quindi il semiarco inferiore di un σ (o di un ε), poi un τ un po’ sbiadito, un ο e la sommità di un λ. Di seguito esigue sezioni di due aste orizzontali, che potrebbero essere quel che rimane di un η o appartenere a due lettere differenti, cioè ad uno ι e all’asta verticale di un κ, parzialmente coperto dall’adiacente lacuna. Infine, chiarissimo

²³ Gigante (1997) 153–4: “La lettura ἐπι[τ]ομ[ήν] — una sfortunata δευτέρα φροντίς dello stesso Jensen — è del tutto falsa. Così alla l. 28 s. ἐπετέλμετο è lettura ugualmente arbitraria.”

²⁴ Acosta Méndez-Angeli (1992) 151.

²⁵ Ioppolo (1996) 716 n. 4.

è un α, che, erroneamente attribuito ad un sottoposto assieme alla lettera precedente,²⁶ è stato da Gigante rivendicato al nostro testo. Quanto agli apografi, il napoletano esibisce ἐπι[.]ολ[, l'oxoniense]πι[.]τομα. La lezione ἐπιστολικά possiede in più rispetto ad ἐπιστολήν il vantaggio di rendere conto anche dell'α che è nitidamente riconoscibile alla fine della sequenza prima del successivo τ[ὸ ἴ]διον. E comunque, come sottolinea Gigante, ἐπιστολ["è lettura certissima" del papiro.²⁷

Ciò nondimeno lo studioso napoletano continua a mostrarsi favorevole al Peripatetico sulla base della solita analogia con i *Caratteri* di Teofrasto. Ora, invece se, come ormai sembra assodato, Filodemo si riferisce al Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ. come a degli ἐπιστολικά, non si può più trascurare il giudizio che fu di Rostagni e Gallavotti ed ora di Ioppolo, lo stesso che la scelta alquanto arbitraria della forma ἐπι[τ]ομήν aveva indebitamente oscurato. In effetti quest'ultima aveva avuto un'importanza decisiva nel rimuovere la tesi che l'autore dello scritto fosse lo Stoico per accreditare quella contraria. Si è detto più volte, infatti, che proprio una raccolta di epistole in quattro libri (Ἐπιστολῶν δ') era l'unica opera, tra quelle riportate da Diogene Laerzio sotto il nome di Aristone di Chio, non atetizzata da Panezio e Sosicrate, laddove nulla sappiamo di un epistolario del Peripatetico. Tale argomento, se non ha la virtù di dimostrare direttamente che il Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ. appartiene al filosofo stoico, possiede almeno il potere di riaprire un dibattito che era stato frettolosamente concluso a favore del Peripatetico sulla base di una lettura del papiro ora rivelatasi arbitraria.

2. Il confronto con la tradizione peripatetica

Com'è noto, il confronto tra il Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ. e i *Caratteri* di Teofrasto e la constatazione che il χαρακτηρισμός fu genere eminentemente coltivato dai discepoli di Aristotele è stato l'argomento che più di tutti ha pesato sul problema dell'attribuzione, facendo pendere il

²⁶ Acosta Méndez-Angeli (1992) 209.

²⁷ Il termine ἐπιστολικά, usato come titolo per designare una collezione di epistole, è attestato anche in D.L. 10.25, in riferimento all'epicureo Ermarco, in Gal. 8.150.4 e in Sor. *Gynaecia* 4.6.1. Cf. Obbink (1988) 434.

piatto della bilancia a favore del Peripatetico. Cercherò allora di delineare in questa sede una serie di rapidi raffronti con Aristotele e la tradizione peripatetica, replicando alle argomentazioni che sono state avanzate in questa stessa sede da S. Vogt e soffermandomi in particolare sulle *Etiche*, la *Retorica*, il trattato pseudo-aristotelico *Sulle virtù e i vizi*, i *Fisiognomici* e, naturalmente i *Caratteri* di Teofrasto.

Innanzitutto non è forse privo di significato il fatto che in tutto Aristotele il termine ὑπερήφανος si ritrovi solo due volte con il valore di “superbo.”²⁸ Similmente ὑπερηφανία si rinviene una sola volta, ma con il significato di “magnificenza.”²⁹ La comparazione con le *Etiche*, lungi dal rivelare elementi di contatto, sembra evidenziare ineludibili divergenze. Innanzitutto non vi è mai attestato il termine ὑπερήφανος o ὑπερηφανία e quelli che più gli si avvicinano sono concepiti in maniera molto diversa, talora specularmente rispetto all'autore del *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.* Si pensi soltanto all'αὐθέκαστος, che in Aristone è la sottospecie di un vizio (la ὑπερηφανία), laddove in Aristotele è l'incarnazione di una virtù (la “veracità” o “schiettezza”) o al fatto che mentre dallo Stagirita esso è presentato come termine medio tra ἁλαζών (il “millantatore”) e ἔργων, in Aristone si trova sullo stesso piano degli altre due, rappresentando essi tre diverse sottospecie dello stesso vizio.

Ma quel che più conta è il modo del tutto diverso di concepire l'ironia nei due autori. Mentre per Aristone ἔργων si configura come ἁλαζόνος εἶδος (col. 21.39), in Aristotele vi compare come diametralmente opposto all'ἁλαζών. Soprattutto in Aristotele ἔργων-εία non ha una connotazione negativa. Al contrario essa, a differenza dell'ἁλαζονεία, di cui ci si serve per arricchire o per conseguire cariche, è sempre disinteressata e, se usata con misura, senza dissimulare meriti che sono troppo comuni ed evidenti, ce se ne può avvalere legittimamente, come fanno gli uomini colti (χαριέστεροι), i quali se ne servono “per fuggire l'ostentazione” (φεύγοντες τὸ ὀγκηρόν). Così anche il μεγαλόψυχος (il “magnanimo”), solitamente παρρησιαστής, la può utilizzare nei confronti della massa (πρὸς τοὺς πολλούς). In definitiva, come afferma esplicitamente Aristotele, “è il millantatore che si contrappone chiaramente all'uomo sincero, perchè

²⁸ *Rhet.* 1390b33 e 1391a33.

²⁹ *Ath. Pol.* 50.3.

è peggiore dell'ironico.”³⁰ In Aristone, invece, l'ironia ha un accezione sempre e comunque negativa. All'opposto rispetto ad Aristotele, essa non è una disinteressata dissimulazione dei propri meriti, ma un mezzo formidabile per affermare, attraverso artifici dialettici di ogni genere, la propria eccellenza sugli interlocutori. E così, la professione di ignoranza che ne trapela, pur nella somiglianza con il Socrate platonico, che vi viene esplicitamente nominato e al quale spesso si rimanda, ne rappresenta piuttosto una forma iperbolica e degenerare. Tale concezione negativa dell'ironia (talmente negativa che Aristone vi dedica ben due colonne, fatto unico nel *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.*), si concilia, invece, particolarmente bene con il pensiero stoico sull'argomento, che considerava l'ironia un mezzo proprio degli stolti, indegno di un uomo libero e, in particolare, del sapiente.³¹

Quanto ai *Fisiognomici*, vi figurano due passi che definiscono alcuni rapidi tratti dell'εἶρων e dell'αὐθάδης i quali, però, non trovano alcun riscontro nell'epistola aristonea.³² Se si guarda, poi, al criterio che utilizza il suo autore per distinguere, nel cosiddetto primo catalogo, i differenti caratteri umani che vi compaiono, ci si può avvedere che esso non è né di tipo né etico, né medico, ma fisiognomico, appunto, sicché nel caso specifico non è legittimo parlare di diagnosi, come alcuni vorrebbero, poichè i differenti tipi umani ivi catalogati non sono concepiti né come vizi, né come malattie, ma come *fisionomie*, vale a dire caratteri umani fondati su una φύσις, e non frutto di un qualche πάθος. Nell'epistola aristonea, al contrario, ci troviamo di fronte a veri e propri vizi che è possibile combattere e di cui è necessario liberarsi e che Aristone paragona esplicitamente alla malattia fisica.³³ Inoltre l'analogia fisiognomica dei differenti caratteri umani con gli animali, sulla quale è fondato tutto il primo catalogo, non trova riscontro di sorta

³⁰ Arist. *EN* 1127a13–b33, *EE* 1221a6, 1221a24–5, 1233b38–34a3. Cf. Ioppolo (1996) 721–3.

³¹ Stob. 2.108 (*SVF* 3.630): τὸ δ' εἰρωνεύεσθαι φαύλων εἶναι φασιν, οὐδένα γὰρ ἐλεύθερον καὶ σπουδαῖον εἰρωνεύεσθαι.

³² Ps.-Arist. *Physiogn.* 808a27–9: εἴρωνος σημεία πῖονα τὰ περὶ τὸ πρόσωπον, καὶ τὰ περὶ τὰ ὄμματα ρυτιδῶδη· ὑπῶδες τὸ πρόσωπον τῷ ἡθελ φαίνεται. 811b 33–5: οἱ δὲ τετράγωνον σύμμετρον τῷ μετώπῳ ἔχοντες μεγαλόψυχοι· ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ τοὺς λέοντας. οἱ δὲ συννεφὲς ἔχοντες αὐθάδεις· ἀναφέρεται ἐπὶ ταῦρον καὶ λέοντα. 811b39–12a1: ἥ τε συννεφὴς ἕξις αὐθάδειαν ἐμφαίνει.

³³ Col. 15.22–6: καὶ διαιρεῖν μεγαλοψυχίαν ὑπερηφα[ν]ίας, ἀλλὰ μὴ συμφύρειν ὥς ἐν καὶ ταῦτόν· διαφ[έ]ρει γὰρ ὅσον καὶ [έ]πὶ τοῦ σώματος οἰδήσεως εὐεξία.

nel *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.* Il fatto, poi, che tanto quest'ultimo quanto l'autore dei *Fisiognomici* privilegino la descrizione di caratteri negativi non comporta necessariamente che Aristone li preferisse alla caratterizzazione dei tipi virtuosi. Se Aristone, specialmente nella seconda sezione della sua opera, tratta esclusivamente determinati vizi è semplicemente perchè con essi si propone di descrivere le sottospecie di un vizio che, in quanto tale, non può avere manifestazioni positive.

Allo stesso modo, per quanto riguarda il trattato *Sulle virtù e i vizi* (che si riferisce in un caso del tutto isolato all'*ἀλαζονεία* ("millanteria"), ma concependola come una forma di *ἀδικία*),³⁴ non mi sembra si possano ravvisare delle corrispondenze decisive. Il fatto che a ciascuna virtù o vizio si faccia seguire una lista di altre virtù e vizi ad essi collegati non è di per sè sufficiente a dimostrare una presunta dipendenza metodologica dell'epistola aristonea dall'autore del trattato pseudo-aristotelico, tanto più che mentre in quest'ultimo essi vengono seccamente elencati, in Aristone essi sono regolarmente sviluppati e minutamente descritti. Né, tantomeno, in quest'ultimo vengono mai richiamate le virtù corrispondenti ai vizi descritti, se non nel caso della *μεγαλοψυχία* ("magnanimità") e della *σεμνότης* ("gravité").³⁵

Ora, però, è naturalmente nei *Caratteri* di Teofrasto che, sulla scorta di tutta una tradizione di studi la quale, come abbiamo visto, risale a H. Sauppe, si è voluto vedere l'elemento decisivo per inserire il *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.* all'interno della tradizione peripatetica. Ebbene, se è indubbio che, a giudicare dalla forma, tanto gli uni quanto l'altro rappresentano due *χαρακτηρισμοί*, è altrettanto incontestabile l'eterogeneità di stile e di fini che differenziano i due opuscoli. Si ha cioè l'impressione, come affermava il Pasquali, che, mentre "i tipi descritti da Teofrasto [...] sono per lo più borghesi o contadineschi," quelli di Aristone appaiono più gravi e universali.³⁶ Già Rostagni e Gallavotti rimarcarono la grande differenza che intercorre tra le due descrizioni caratterologiche in questione.³⁷ Mentre, infatti, il discepolo di Aristotele fa una rassegna di stereotipi, compiacendosi di una fine osservazione dei difetti umani e con uno scopo squisitamente letterario,

³⁴ Ps.-Arist. *De virt. et vit.* 1251b2-3: ἀκολουθεῖ δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ συκοφαντία, ἀλαζονεία.

³⁵ Col. 15.22-33 e col. 21.1-3.

³⁶ Pasquali (1918) 146.

³⁷ Rostagni (1920) 441 n. 1 e Gallavotti (1927) 470-2. Cf. anche Ioppolo (1996) 723-4 e n. 22.

l'autore del *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.* “fa opera essenzialmente morale,”³⁸ conducendo una minuziosa descrizione che, pur brillando per il notevole pregio artistico, costituisce una vera e propria indagine filosofica orientata al concreto obiettivo di curare una patologia dell'anima.

Non va nemmeno dimenticata la prospettiva del tutto differente con cui sono separatamente tratteggiati i caratteri che essi hanno in comune, vale a dire l'εἰρωνεία, l'αὐθάδεια e la ὑπερηφανία. A proposito dell'ironia in Teofrasto e Aristone, infatti, già qualche anno fa A. M. Ioppolo sottolineava che, mentre leggendo *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.* si ricava l'immagine di un abile dissimulatore che umilia se stesso per sminuire gli altri, con il fine di prevalere dialetticamente sull'interlocutore, in Teofrasto il tipo ironico non è più di un misero opportunista che mente a scopo di lucro. Inoltre l'ironico di Aristone è esemplato quasi interamente sul Socrate platonico e ad esso espressamente si richiama, anche se in una luce non favorevole, e così tutta la descrizione è collocata in un contesto dialettico. Si tratta, comunque, di un personaggio di notevole calibro intellettuale, che per le sue peculiari caratteristiche non può essere accostato all'ironico di Teofrasto, il quale è un banale ipocrita che con Socrate non ha nulla a che vedere.³⁹ Se, poi, si passa ad esaminare le due descrizioni teofrastei dell'αὐθάδης e dello ὑπερήφανος sarà sufficiente avvedersi che, dei rapidi tratti con cui essi vengono caratterizzati, nemmeno uno trova adeguato riscontro nel *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.*, per convincersi definitivamente che non può essere dimostrata la presunta dipendenza dell'epistola aristonea dal discepolo di Aristotele.

Queste considerazioni permettono anche di fare chiarezza su un equivoco che da quasi un secolo è di ostacolo ad una corretta comprensione dei *Caratteri*. In effetti nella storia della ricezione dell'opuscolo teofrasteo, gli studiosi hanno sempre ritenuto, ed anche oggi ritengono, con una sorta di *petitio principii*, che, se non è possibile ricavare dal singolo esame del libello un'esplicita motivazione etica, essa si deve dedurre dall'analogia con il *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.*, dove invece tale motivazione è evidentissima.⁴⁰ Ma certo è del tutto illegittimo, in nome

³⁸ Gallavotti (1927) 471.

³⁹ Ioppolo (1996) 723–4.

⁴⁰ Navarre (1924) 211 e 270 n. 1: “J’incline à croire que chez Théophraste le rôle

di una indimostrata identità di scuola, e sulla base della semplice osservazione che la descrizione di caratteri fu un genere in cui i Peripatetici furono campioni, associare due scritti come i nostri, così distanti per impostazione, spirito ed intenti, pretendendo di applicare all'uno la destinazione morale dell'altro. Se, dunque, come sembra, non è lecito parlare del trattatello aristoneo come di una *imitatio theophrastea*, risulta altrettanto indebito il tentativo di applicare ai *Caratteri* le stesse finalità palesemente riconoscibili nel *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.*

Per di più il *χαρακτηρισμός*, come già rimarcava Gallavotti, anche se produsse una speciale fioritura nei giardini del Liceo, avendo come esponenti, oltre a Teofrasto, Licone e Satiro, deve essere considerato un genere “non rigidamente classificabile: può servire a qualsiasi scrittore con qualsiasi intento; acquista valore e determinazione e significato solamente dal contesto.”⁴¹ È illuminante in proposito una testimonianza di Seneca secondo la quale Posidonio affermava “che sarebbe stata utile la descrizione di ciascuna virtù. Posidonio la chiama etologia, altri *χαρακτηρισμός*, la quale descrive i tratti distintivi di ciascuna virtù e vizio e i dettagli in base ai quali specie simili si differenziano tra di loro.”⁴² In effetti, anche se tale testimonianza è cronologicamente successiva all'autore del *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.* (posto che egli vada identificato con Aristone di Ceo o con il Chio), essa dimostra come anche in ambito stoico non solo non si disdegnasse lo studio di caratteri, ma come anzi esso fosse visto come un fondamentale strumento protrettico da associare alla precettistica, alla persuasione e dissuasione, alla consolazione e alla cosiddetta ricerca delle cause (eziologia).

3. Il carattere protrettico dello scritto

Il *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.*, così come ci è pervenuto, si presenta come un'epistola protrettica divisa in due sezioni, di cui la prima (compresa

des *Charactères* était le même que chez son imitateur.” Cf. Pasquali (1926) 88 e, recentemente, Rusten et al. (1993).

⁴¹ Gallavotti (1927) 472.

⁴² Sen. *Ep.* 95.65–6: αἶτ [sc. Posidonius] utilem futuram esse descriptionem cuiusque virtutis; hanc Posidonius ‘ethologian’ vocat, quidam *χαρακτηρισμόν* appellant, signa cuiusque virtutis et vitii ac notas reddentem, quibus inter se similia discriminantur.

tra coll. 10.30 e 16.27) raccoglie una serie di brevi esortazioni, ciascuna introdotta da un infinito ed avente ad oggetto un particolare aspetto della ὑπερηφανία dal quale Aristone mette in guardia il suo interlocutore. La lunga serie di infinitive con ellissi del soggetto⁴³ dimostra con chiarezza che Filodemo sta riportando il pensiero del suo autore in forma indiretta. Nel testo originario, pertanto, ogni esortazione doveva essere introdotta da un congiuntivo esortativo con soggetto ellittico, come si evince da una di esse (col. 11.26: μὴ προσεπι(ρ)ρητορεύ[ειν]), che per il fatto di essere introdotta dalla negazione μὴ, è di senso evidentemente volitivo. Si tratta solitamente di ripetuti inviti a “riflettere” o a “ricordare,” ad “avvedersi” o a “paventare” i disagi e le conseguenze nefaste di chi, sull’onda di una buona sorte, si lascia trascinare dal compiacimento altero di sé, delle proprie azioni e delle proprie ricchezze. La sezione, pertanto, non costituisce propriamente uno studio di caratteri. In essa l’intento caratterologico è palesemente in secondo piano rispetto a quello parenetico. L’esame delle caratteristiche formali ci permette, invece, di riconoscervi senza equivoci un inedito esempio di quell’*exhortatio*, che insieme alla *dissuasio*, costituiva uno dei generi di quella parte dell’etica chiamata protrettica.

Tutta la sezione, nella quale si fornisce una descrizione generale del vizio, funge da introduzione a quella successiva (col. 16.27–24.21) la quale, per il fatto di descrivere più dettagliatamente quello che nella prima era semplicemente abbozzato, si pone in stretta continuità di forma e di contenuto con la precedente. In effetti la seconda sezione che, come rivela il passaggio dall’infinito ai modi finiti, Filodemo mostra di citare direttamente dalla sua fonte, costituisce una minuziosa rassegna delle sottospecie dello ὑπερήφανος, che Aristone classifica in sette categorie: “l’insolente” (ὁ αὐθάδης),⁴⁴ “il sufficiente” (ὁ

⁴³ Μετα(ρ)ρίπτειν | τὴν δι[άνοι]αν, col. 10.32–3; [λα]μβάνειν πρ[ὸ] ὀφ[θαλ]μ[ῶν], col. 11.4–5; [κ]αὶ μυ[ημ]ονεύειν, col. 11.13; μὴ προσεπι(ρ)ρητορεύ[ειν], col. 11.26; καὶ π[αραμετρεῖ]ν ἑαυτόν, col. 12.4; παρυπομιμν[ήσ]κε[ι]σθαι δὲ καί, col. 12.12–3; ἐννοεῖν | δὲ καί, col. 12.30–1; παρατιθέναι δὲ καί, col. 13.8; ἐννοεῖν δὲ καί, col. 13.30; παρυπομιμνήσκειν δὲ καί, col. 14.2–3; λογίζεσθαι | δὲ καί, col. 14.36–7; καὶ πολλάκις ἑαυτὸν ἐπερωτᾶν, col. 15.12–3; καὶ διαιρεῖν μεγαλοψυχίαν ὑπερηφα[ν]ίας, col. 15.22–3; καὶ λογίζεσθαι, col. 15.33; καὶ φ[ο]βεῖσθαι, col. 16.2–3; ἐννοεῖ[ν δ’], col. 16.15.

⁴⁴ Col. 16.29–17.17.

αὐθέκαστος),⁴⁵ “l’onnisciente” (ὁ παντειδήςμων),⁴⁶ “lo sprezzante” (ὁ ὑπερόπτης)⁴⁷ — all’interno del quale si distinguono “il pomposo” (ὁ σεμνοκόπος)⁴⁸ e “l’altezzoso” (ὁ βρενθυόμενος)⁴⁹ — “l’ironico” (ὁ εἴρων),⁵⁰ “il mortificatore” (ὁ εὐτελιστής ο ἑξευτελιστής) e “l’annichilatore” (ὁ οὐδενωτής ο ἑξουδενωτής).⁵¹ Lo stilema del quale egli si serve (τοιιοῦτος ἔστιν, οἶος + inf.) è quello tipico del *χαρακτηρισμός*. A differenza della prima sezione, ci troviamo, dunque, di fronte ad un vero e proprio studio caratterologico che, però, come si è detto, ben poco condivide (se non la forma) con i più noti *Caratteri* teofrastei.

Nel complesso lo scritto si presenta, dunque, come un’epistola protrettica di taglio caratterologico, che ha per argomento la descrizione di un vizio e come unico fine quello di fornire un *remedium* a colui che ne è affetto. Ora è stato affermato in questa stessa sede, pur nel riconoscimento del carattere unitario di entrambe le sezioni, che solo alla prima andrebbe attribuita una finalità di ammonimento morale, mentre la seconda non avrebbe altro scopo che quello generico di definire il soggetto.⁵² Ora, però, lo spiccato carattere protrettico dello scritto si desume con chiarezza non solo dalla prima sezione, dove Aristone si rivolge al suo ipotetico interlocutore mediante una serie di vere e proprie esortazioni e dissuasioni, ma anche dalla seconda, che ha come preciso obiettivo quello di invitare l’interlocutore medesimo, mediante la proposizione di una serie di modelli negativi, a riconoscere in essi le proprie manie e così convincersi a deporre la propria superbia, sia per il disordine morale che essa comporta, sia per non dover incappare nelle conseguenze funeste che ne derivano. In altri termini il taglio più vistosamente caratterologico della seconda sezione non è fine a se stesso, ma strettamente strumentale al carattere protrettico di tutto lo scritto e la descrizione dei caratteri è tanto più sistematica e dettagliata quanto più benefici il suo autore desidera che ne risultino gli effetti terapeutici sul suo interlocutore.

⁴⁵ Col. 17.17–18.11.

⁴⁶ Col. 18.11–19.2 e col. 20.3–32.

⁴⁷ Col. 20.32–21.37.

⁴⁸ Col. 21.3–13.

⁴⁹ Col. 21.13–37.

⁵⁰ Col. 21.37–23.37.

⁵¹ Col. 24.1–21.

⁵² Cf. Vogt in questo volume.

Inoltre il forte intento protrettico di tutta l'epistola si ricava con certezza dal titolo *Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας* che, come abbiamo visto, si riferisce a tutto lo scritto e non soltanto a una parte di esso. Qualunque sia, infatti, il valore da attribuire al verbo *κουφίζειν*, “liberare” o, come alcuni hanno detto, “alleviare,” Aristone propone al suo interlocutore una serie di riflessioni finalizzate a combattere — con maggiore o minore energia, se si vuole, ma comunque pur sempre a combattere — il vizio della superbia. Risulta, pertanto, innegabile che le due sezioni dello scritto possiedono una medesima finalità, che conferisce a tutta l'opera la sua unità ideale. A questo punto, però, non si può fare a meno di sottolineare, come ho già segnalato in altra sede, che quanti attribuiscono al verbo *κουφίζειν* il significato di “alleviare” non considerano che *κουφίζειν* è attestato pure nell'accezione di “sgravare, levare,” cioè di togliere un peso di dosso a qualcuno e, quindi, “alleggerirlo” di quel peso. Allo stesso modo il latino *levare* significa sia “alleviare, mitigare,” che “togliere, levare.” E così, l'argomento secondo il quale, l'autore del *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.* non potrebbe essere identificato con lo stoico Aristone di Chio per il fatto che quello si propone di “alleggerire” soltanto il suo interlocutore dai lacci della superbia, senza volerlo liberare definitivamente,⁵³ si rivela del tutto inconsistente.⁵⁴

Invece noi sappiamo che per gli Stoici quella parte dell'insegnamento morale dedicata al discorso esortatorio che si serviva di esempi concreti occupava un ruolo fondamentale. Nella *διαίρεσις* dell'etica stoica essa rientrava nella sezione dedicata alle *προτροπαί* e alle *ἀποτροπαί*, cioè a quelle esortazioni e dissuasioni che per mezzo di modelli positivi o negativi invitavano a praticare la virtù e a combattere i vizi.⁵⁵ In particolare è ampiamente attestato che Aristone di Chio non soltanto coltivò questo genere, ma che su di esso fondava il suo metodo pedagogico e che se da un lato rifiutava la precettistica, in quanto incapace di formare l'uomo alla virtù, dall'altro egli credeva

⁵³ Gli Stoici, infatti, propugnavano l'eliminazione definitiva dei vizi. Cf. Knögel (1933) 15–6, Philipsson (1934), Acosta Méndez-Angeli (1992) 217, e Gigante (1996) 131–2.

⁵⁴ Si veda Ranocchia (2001) 256.

⁵⁵ D.L. 7.84: Τὸ δ' ἠθικὸν μέρος τῆς φιλοσοφίας διαιροῦσιν εἷς τε τὸν περὶ ὁρμῆς καὶ εἰς τὸν περὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν τόπον καὶ εἰς τὸν περὶ παθῶν καὶ περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ περὶ τέλους περὶ τε τῆς πρώτης ἀξίας καὶ τῶν πράξεων καὶ περὶ τῶν καθηκόντων προτροπῶν τε καὶ ἀποτροπῶν. Cf. Ioppolo (1980) 133–7.

fermamente nella descrizione di modelli concreti da proporre all'imitazione dei προκόπτοντες. Come ha recentemente dimostrato A. M. Ioppolo sulla base di uno studio complessivo delle *Epistole* 94 e 95 di Seneca,⁵⁶ infatti, per Aristone i precetti, prescrivendo dall'esterno comportamenti determinati da adottare nelle singole circostanze, sono del tutto inutili, perché finché permangono le false opinioni e l'errore offusca la mente, non ha senso ingiungere "così vivrai con il padre, così con la moglie." Al contrario l'*exemplum* fornisce un modello concreto da imitare o da ripudiare, cioè un'esemplificazione pratica attraverso la quale tradurre in azione i principi della filosofia (*decreta philosophiae*).⁵⁷ Ed è proprio l'insistenza con la quale Seneca afferma, in polemica con Aristone, che se riteniamo inutili i precetti, allora anche tutte le altre forme di *monitiones* (tra cui le esortazioni e le dissuasioni) risultano altrettanto inutili, a dimostrare che era proprio questo il metodo pedagogico che usava il filosofo stoico.⁵⁸

Ulteriore conferma ci viene da un passo di Sesto Empirico, che attribuisce ad Aristone di Chio "il discorso che, da un lato, rende idonei alla virtù e, dall'altro, allontana dal vizio" (τὸν οἰκείοῦντα μὲν πρὸς ἀρετὴν λόγον, ἀπαλλοτριοῦντα δὲ κακίας),⁵⁹ e da Plutarco, che gli assegna discorsi "discorsi incitanti alla virtù" (λόγοι κινητικοὶ πρὸς ἀρετὴν).⁶⁰ Inoltre Diogene Laerzio (7.163) gli ascrive due libri di *Protrettici* che, quantunque compresi nel novero delle opere atetizzate da Panezio e Sosicrate, non è affatto improbabile che egli abbia potuto scrivere, specialmente laddove si consideri che, come ha mostrato con svariati argomenti la stessa Ioppolo nella sua monografia sul filosofo stoico, molti dei titoli menzionati nel catalogo sono tipicamente stoici o rispecchiano concezioni filosofiche tipicamente aristonee.

⁵⁶ Ioppolo (1999).

⁵⁷ Sen. *Ep.* 95.66: haec res eandem vim habet quam praecipere; nam qui praecipit, dicit: "illa facies, si voles temperans esse"; qui describit, ait: "temperans est, qui illa faciet, qui illis abstinet." Quaeris quid intersit? Alter praecepta virtutis dat, alter exemplar.

⁵⁸ Sen. *Ep.* 95: aut in isto modo licet et consolationes dicas supervacuas et exhortationes: atqui non sunt supervacuae, ergo ne monitiones quidem (21); aut sic et consolationes nega proficere dissuasionesque et adhortationes, obiurgationes et laudationes. Omnia ista monitionum genera sunt (39); isto ergo modo et consolatio supervacua est ... et adhortatio et suasio et ipsa argumentatio (49). Cf. Ioppolo (1999) 22-3 e 28-31.

⁵⁹ *Adv. math.* 7.12 (SVF 1.356).

⁶⁰ *Max. cum princ.* 1 776C (SVF 1.382). Cf. Ioppolo (1980) 41-2 e 136.

L'operazione compiuta dai due esponenti della *Stoa* di mezzo potrebbe essere, allora, un drastico tentativo di epurare, insieme alle opere autentiche di Aristone di Chio, anche le forti tracce ciniche in esse presenti, stante la nota avversione per il cinismo, che aveva già indotto Panezio ad atetizzare la cinicheggiante Πολιτεία di Zenone di Cizio. Va detto, peraltro, che alla critica filologica dell'autorevole esponente della *Stoa* di Mezzo non erano alieni anche altri eccessi, come i giudizi che negavano l'autenticità ad alcuni celebri scritti socratici e al *Fedone* platonico.⁶¹

Ora, se proprio un forte valore protrettico è stato da sempre ravvisato nel Περί τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ. ο, almeno, nella sua prima parte,⁶² non si può fare a meno di prendere in seria considerazione la possibilità che l'epistola aristonea sia quel che ci rimane di un'opera protrettica di ascendenza stoica e, in particolare, un prezioso saggio di quel metodo esortatorio e dissuasorio, caro ad Aristone di Chio, che si avvaleva di modelli esemplari. Questo spiegherebbe anche la forma caratterologica dello scritto che, come abbiamo visto, rimane pur sempre finalizzata al suo scopo protrettico e con esso profondamente sinergica. Lo si deduce in modo speciale nella prima sezione, dove si invita esplicitamente l'interlocutore a guardarsi da quelle stesse manie che vi vengono dettagliatamente descritte, ma anche nella seconda, che fornisce degli specifici modelli negativi, che sono tanto più impietosamente caratterizzati, quanto più recisamente se ne vogliono condannare i comportamenti e deplorare le conseguenze deleterie.

Si aggiunga il fatto che è lo stesso Filodemo a nutrire una notevole fiducia nelle capacità persuasive del suo autore, se conclude il suo libro *Sulla superbia* parafrasando ininterrottamente per quattordici colonne un testo del tutto allotrio,⁶³ che egli evidentemente ritiene utile per il suo *demonstrandum*. Tale atteggiamento è confermato anche dalle parole con cui egli, introducendo il lungo estratto, afferma esplicitamente che Aristone "non inverosimilmente potrebbe convincere qualcuno sugli argomenti che si è riservato."⁶⁴ Ebbene, tutte le fonti antiche sono

⁶¹ Ioppolo (1980) 39–55.

⁶² Già Jensen (1911b) 399–400 si riferiva alla prima sezione dell'operetta come a delle "Paraenese."

⁶³ Si consideri, infatti, che sia nel caso dell'attribuzione ad uno stoico, che in quello dell'assegnazione ad un peripatetico, si tratta comunque di un testo appartenente ad autore di altra scuola.

⁶⁴ Col. 10.26–9.

concordi nell'attribuire ad Aristone di Chio spiccate doti di eloquenza e persuasività, al punto che i contemporanei lo soprannominavano "Sirena."⁶⁵ Egli, inoltre, si avvaleva di paragoni ed esempi, parodiava i poeti e usava prosimetri, adottando un linguaggio espressivo e suadente, che gli guadagnò la sequela di diversi discepoli (detti Ἀριστώνειοι), tra cui lo stesso Eratostene.⁶⁶ Ora tutti questi mezzi stilistici si possono riconoscere in abbondanza nel *Περὶ τοῦ κουφ. ὑπερ.* dove, oltre a paragoni⁶⁷ e citazioni di versi, comici e tragici,⁶⁸ ricchissimi sono i riferimenti a personaggi ed avvenimenti esemplari. Si tratta di aneddoti storici o detti di personaggi celebri inseriti nel testo allo scopo di fornire modelli concreti da imitare o ripudiare. E proprio in questo, come abbiamo visto, consisteva il metodo pedagogico di Aristone di Chio. Ma è anche l'eccezionale capacità descrittiva con cui Aristone tratteggia i suoi tipi nella seconda sezione dell'opera, a tradire una forza espressiva che pienamente si accorda con quanto le fonti ci attestano sull'eloquenza di Aristone di Chio.⁶⁹

Bibliografia

- Acosta Mèndez, E. e Angeli, A. 1992. *Testimonianze su Socrate* (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
 Brink, K. O. 1940. "Peripatos," *Paulys Realencyclopädie*, Suppl. 7: 899–949.
 Capasso, M. 1983. "Epicureismo e Eraclito. Contributo alla ricostruzione della critica epicurea alla filosofia presocratica," in

⁶⁵ D.L. 7.160 (SVF1.333), *Index Stoic.* col. 35 (SVF 1.336), Ael. VH 3.33 (SVF 1.337) e D.L. 7.182 (SVF 1.339). Cf. Ioppolo (1980) 22–4 e Ioppolo (1996) 732–3.

⁶⁶ Per i paragoni si vedano gli ὁμοιώματα conservati in Stobeo e, inoltre, Stob. 3.4.109 (SVF 1.350), D.L. 7.161 (SVF 1.351). Per le parodie si vedano D.L. 4.33 (SVF 1.343) e Sextus PH 1.234 (SVF 1.344), per i prosimetri D.L. 7.160 (SVF 1.333), Euseb. PE 15.62.7–13 (SVF 1.353) e Clem. Alex. Strom. 2.20 (SVF 1.370). Cf. Ioppolo (1980) 22–4 e Ioppolo (1996) 732–3 e n. 61.

⁶⁷ Si vedano il paragone dell'invidia come mal d'occhi dell'anima (col. 12.12–16), dei successi del superbo equiparati alla γεγανωμένη χλάνις (col. 12.16–24), della magnanimità e della superbia assimilate rispettivamente alla salute e alla malattia fisica (col. 15.22–6).

⁶⁸ Col. 11.11–13 (Eur. fr. 420.1 Nauck²) e col. 21.35–7 (Aristoph. Nub. 362).

⁶⁹ Ringrazio la Prof. A. M. Ioppolo per avermi orientato con i suoi consigli, e il Prof. M. Frede per i suoi preziosi suggerimenti.

- Atti del Symposium Heracliteum 1981*, ed. L. Rossetti (Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo), 423–57 = *Comunità senza rivolta. Quattro saggi sull'epicureismo* (Napoli: Bibliopolis 1987), 59–102.
- Caterini, L. 1827. *Herculaneusium Voluminum quae supersunt*, Tom. 3 (Neapoli: Regia Typographia).
- Gallavotti, C. 1927. “Teofrasto e Aristone (Per la genesi dei “Caratteri” teofrastei),” *RFIC* 55: 468–79.
- Gallavotti, C. 1933. Rec. Knögel (1933), *RFIC* 40: 29–33.
- Gercke, A. 1892. “Ariston,” *AGPh* 5: 198–216.
- Gigante, M. 1996. “Atakta XV,” *CErc* 26: 131–2.
- — —. 1997. “Atakta XVI,” *CErc* 27: 151–6.
- Goulet, R., ed. 1989–. *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques* (Paris: Éditions du CNRS).
- Heinze, R., “Ariston von Chios bei Plutarch und Horaz,” *RhM* 45 (1890), 497–523.
- Ioppolo, A. M. 1980. *Aristone di Chio e lo Stoicismo antico* (Napoli: Bibliopolis).
- — —. 1996. “Il Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας: una polemica antiscettica in Filodemo?,” in *L'epicureismo greco e romano. Atti del Congresso internazionale, Napoli 19–26 maggio 1993*, edd. G. Giannantoni, M. Gigante (Napoli: Bibliopolis), 715–34.
- — —. 1999. “*Decreta e praecepta* in Seneca,” in *Atti del Colloquio sulla Filosofia in Età imperiale*, ed. A. Brancacci (Roma: Bibliopolis), 15–36.
- Jensen, C. 1911a. *Philodemi περὶ κακῶν liber decimus* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- — —. 1911b. “Ariston von Keos bei Philodem,” *Hermes* 46: 393–406.
- — —. 1930. “Die Bibliothek von Herculaneum,” *Bonner Jahrbücher* 135: 49–61 = “La biblioteca di Ercolano,” in C. Jensen, W. Schmid, M. Gigante, *Saggi di papirologia ercolanese* (Napoli 1979: Morano), 9–26.
- Kleve, K. 1986. “*Scurra Atticus*. The Epicurean View of Sokrates,” in ΣΥΖΗΤΗΣΙΣ. *Studi sull'epicureismo greco e romano offerti a Marcello Gigante*, (Napoli: Bibliopolis), 245–9.
- Knögel, W. 1933. *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem* = *Klassisch-philologische Studien*, vol. 5 (Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz).

- Krisch, A. 1840. *De theologumenis philosophorum Graecorum* (Göttingen: Diss.).
- Mayer, A. 1907–10. *Aristonstudien*, *Philologus*, Suppl. 11.
- Mouraviev, S. N. 1987. “La vie d’Héraclite de Diogène Laërce. Analyse stratigraphique – Le texte de base – Un nouveau fragment d’Ariston de Céos?,” *Phronesis* 32: 1–33.
- Mras, K. 1955. “Ariston von Keos,” *Wiener Studien* 39: 88–98.
- Navarre, O. 1924. *Caractères de Théophraste. Commentaire exégétique et critique, précédé d’une introduction sur l’origine du livre, l’histoire du texte et le classement des manuscrits* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Obbink, D. 1988. “Hermarchus, *Against Empedocles*,” *CQ* 38: 428–35.
- Pasquali, G. 1918. “Sui Caratteri di Teofrasto,” *Rassegna Italiana* 2: 143–50.
- — —. 1926. Rec. Navarre (1924), *Gnomon* 2: 88.
- Philipsson, R. 1934. Rec. Knögel (1933), *PhW* 48: 1329–34.
- Ranocchia, G. 2001. “Filodemo e il *Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας*,” Contributo ad una nuova edizione del *PHerc.* 1008,” *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 10: 231–63.
- Ranocchia, G. 2005. *Aristone*, Sul modo di liberare dalla superbia, *nel decimo libro De vitiis di Filodemo* (Napoli: Bibliopolis), di prossima pubblicazione.
- Rieth, O. 1936. Rec. Knögel (1933), *Gnomon* 12: 618–19.
- Rostagni, A. 1920. “Sui «Caratteri» di Teofrasto,” *RFIC* 48: 417–43 = *Scritti Minori*, vol. 1: *Aesthetica* (Torino 1955: Bottega d’Erasmus), 327–55.
- Rusten, J., I. C. Cunningham, A.D. Knox. 1993. *Theophrastus, Characters. Herodas, Mimes. Cercidas and the Choliambic Poets* (Cambridge MA: Loeb Classical Texts).
- Saal, N. 1852. *De Aristone Chio et Herillo Carthaginensi Stoicis Commentatio*. Pars I: *De Aristonis Chii vita scriptis et doctrina* (Köln: J. B. Bachem).
- Sauppe, H. 1849–53. “Philodemi de vitiis liber decimus. Ad voluminis Herculaneensis exempla neapolitanum et oxoniense distinxit supplevit explicavit,” *Jahresb. d. Wilhelm-Ernst. Gymn.* (Weimar).
- Wehrli, F. 1968². *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 6: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (Basel, Stuttgart: Schwabe).



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

5

Characters in Aristo

Sabine Vogt

I

Philodemus in *On Vices* paraphrases and quotes Aristo on the appearances and consequences of arrogance, including several definitions and sketches of character types related to the arrogant man (αὐθάδης). Here I shall investigate the tradition of character studies in which Aristo stands, taking into account criteria of form, style, and technique as well as the content of two exemplary sketches. The main focus will be on the purposes of texts that provide what I call “conceptual” and “inferential” definitions.

The problematic transmission of the Aristo passages in Philodemus requires anyone who deals with them to take a position on three basic questions. First, which parts of the text should we ascribe to Aristo, and which to Philodemus? Second, did Philodemus draw on one work by Aristo, or two? Third, and most important, which Aristo does Philodemus cite?

The first question is fairly easy to answer, since Philodemus provides clear signals in the text.¹ In the first part of the Aristo passages,

¹ See Peter Stork on **21a** n. 1.

Philodemus announces that he will “summarize the main points” (κεφαλαιώσομαι τὰς δυνάμεις αὐτῶν) of what Aristo “selects to say” about arrogance,² then gives a long summary about arrogance in indirect speech (cols. 10.30–16.27 = **21a.30–21g.27**). He concludes this section by echoing that opening phrase: “That much, then, is enough to select to say about these matters”³ (τοσαῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱκανὰ καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐπειπεῖν, **21g.27–8**). When he then turns to discuss several subtypes of the arrogant man (**21g.29–21o.21**), he shifts to direct speech – which he explicitly marks as a quotation by inserting into the second sentence the phrase “says Aristo” (φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων, **21g.34**). The opening words of the last sentence in this long passage perform a similar function: “This, clearly, is also why he says ...” (διὸ καὶ δῆ[λον] ὅτι φησὶν ..., **21o.17**). Philodemus then closes his discussion of the topic with another reference to his source: “And here we shall end this excerpt from him [Aristo], and append to it the treatise about the other vices which we are attempting to treat” (καὶ τὸν ὑπομνημα[τισ]μὸν δὲ τοῦτον αὐτοῦ καταπαύσομεν, ἐπισυνάψομεν δ’ αὐτῷ τὸν περὶ τῶν ἄλλων κακιῶν ὧν δοκιμάζομεν ποι[εῖ]σθαι λόγον, **21o.21–7**). Philodemus thereby not only marks the end of the passages taken from his source but also, by using a finite verb in the first person plural, signals that he is again taking over as speaker and author, just as he did by using the first person singular at the beginning of his references to Aristo (**21a.29**: κεφαλαιώσομαι). Nowhere else in these passages does a first-person verb occur.⁴

² I follow Stork’s syntactic interpretation of the indefinite pronoun *τινα* and his translation of the complicated sentence **21a.26–30**; cf. **21a** n. 5–6.

³ I disagree with Stork’s translation of ἐπειπεῖν as “quote” and prefer the more general sense of “select to say”; cf. LSJ s.v.

⁴ The use of first-person forms is a clear indication that Philodemus himself is speaking. This has not always been accepted. Witness the translation of fr. 14 Wehrli (**21g–o**) in Rusten (1993) 182–95. Rusten sees reasons to identify “tedious and contorted analyses of the disadvantages of each trait” that are “interspersed with the character descriptions” of Aristo’s (182). He believes that the passage between the description of the “know-it-all” and the *ieron* (col. 20.3–21.37 = **21k.3–21l.37**) as well as the very end (col. 24.17–21 = **21o.17–21**) are Philodemus’ comments — thus attributing all references to definitions and evaluations of the character traits to Philodemus, and reconstructing a text of Aristo’s which contains nothing but character sketches in the style of the Theophrastean *Characters*. Since there are no clear indications in the text calling for a shift of author, I find it hard to follow this view. Moreover, such a “creation” of a truly “Theophrastean” Aristo seems to me an unjustified *petitio principii*.

The word ὑπομνηματισμός, which Stork translates as “excerpt,” also means “commentary.” It thus allows to be interpreted as referring both to the verbatim quotations of the second part of the Aristo passages and to the (possibly selective) paraphrases in indirect speech in the first part. That brings us to the second question, about the sources used by Philodemus: do all the texts quoted or referred to come from the same work, which Philodemus entitles Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας (*On Relieving Arrogance*), or should only the “summary” immediately after the title be ascribed to that work? An obvious difference in form and argument starting in the last lines of col. 16 (**21g.29–38**) and also some discrepancies in the meaning of ὑπερηφανία have been cited by scholars as reasons for denying a single source. Fritz Wehrli, for instance, in his edition of Aristo, distinguishes two fragments (frs. 13 and 14) and argues that each derives from a separate work.⁵ Yet the two passages can easily be read as closely connected. Moreover, since what Wehrli separates as fr. 14 (**21g.29–21o**) begins immediately after the end of his fr. 13 (**21a–21g.28**), it is hard to see why Philodemus would suddenly switch to a different work by Aristo. Therefore, the problem should be approached from the opposite direction. Those who claim that fr. 14 Wehrli contains quotations from a different work should provide convincing arguments. So long as that has not been done, it is simpler and more logical to assume that Philodemus continues citing the same book and that this is why he does not repeat the title.

The third question is the most difficult: Which Aristo is the one twice named — without any further specification — by Philodemus as the author (**21a.10** and **21g.34**)? Peter Stork, in **21a** n. 1, summarizes the scholarly debate over whether it is the Stoic Aristo of Chios or the Peripatetic Aristo of Ceos. Since the debate is discussed in more detail elsewhere in this volume,⁶ I simply state at the outset that I proceed on the hypothesis that *On Relieving Arrogance* was written by the Peripatetic Aristo of Ceos. Indeed, an account of Aristo’s position within the tradition of character studies — which is the focus of my discussion here — provides further evidence supporting this attribution. For the tradition is thoroughly Peripatetic, and its form and techniques are very stable. The variations in the content of these works can easily be explained by

⁵ Wehrli (1952/1968) 53–5.

⁶ See the contributions in this volume by Ranocchia (in favor of Aristo of Chios) and Dorandi and Tsouna (in favor of Aristo of Ceos).

the varying contexts and their shifting focus. Thus, the discrepancies some scholars have rightly noted between Aristo's treatment of arrogance and Peripatetic doctrine are not, in my view, strong arguments against identifying Philodemus' Aristo with the Peripatetic from Ceos.⁷

II

The creation and depiction of character is as old as art and poetry, and individuals or types with different traits of personality can be seen from Homer onwards in fictional as well as in historical, philosophical, and medical literature. This is not the place to give a survey of this vast topic, and even less to go into details, but it will be useful to consider briefly the ways in which literary characterization is constructed. There are basically two ways. One is for the author to describe someone's character directly, for instance by supplying epithets ("Thersites, unbridled of tongue": Θερσίτης ... ἀμετροεπής, *Il.* 2.212) or an explicit evaluation ("most hateful especially to Achilles and Odysseus, for he used to quarrel with them both": ἔχθιστος δ' Ἀχιλλῆϊ μάλιστ' ἦν ἡδ' Ὀδυσῆϊ· ἰ τὼ γὰρ νεικείεσκε, *Il.* 2.220–1). The other way is to characterize someone indirectly by narrating what they do or say or think; for the portrayal either of externally observable behavior and speech or of inner thoughts and feelings can reveal traits and dispositions of character; witness the extended account of Thersites' speech attacking Agamemnon at the assembly of Achaean warriors in *Iliad* 2.212–44. Another indirect form of characterization is the description of someone's looks, which leaves physiognomic inferences about character up to the audience; consider Thersites again: "the ugliest man who ever came to Troy. Bandy-legged he was, with one foot clubbed, both shoulders humped together, curving over his caved-in chest, and bobbing above, his skull warped to a point, sprouting clumps of scraggly, woolly hair" (*Il.* 2.216–19).⁸ Inferences from physical appearance can

⁷ Stephen White suggested to me a further argument in support of the attribution of *On Relieving Arrogance* to Aristo the Peripatetic: if the title quoted by Philodemus is correct, the mere notion of "relieving" (κουφίζειν) arrogance comes suspiciously close to Aristotle's notion of catharsis.

⁸ *Il.* 2.216–19: αἴσχιστος δὲ ἀνὴρ ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθε· / φορκὸς ἔην, χωλὸς δ' ἕτερον πόδα· τὼ δέ οἱ ὦμω / κυρτῷ, ἐπὶ στήθος συνοχωκότε· αὐτὰρ ὑπερθε / φοξὸς ἔην κεφαλῇν, ψεδνὴ δ' ἐπενήνοθε λάχνη. Another widespread subtype of physiognomic characterization is the comparison with animals, which we know from the language

be difficult and misleading,⁹ so the more telling way to depict people's character is to narrate their behavior, speech, or thoughts. That affords insight into their motivations and reasons, which are the basis for defining character types. Because this approach works by inference from signs to attributes, we may call it the "inferential" approach to character study.¹⁰ The signs from which character is inferred are either internal (motivations and reasons which lead to specific behavior) or external (bodily features and appearance). This inferential approach is complemented by what we may call the "conceptual" approach, which defines character types by linguistic or logical methods: correlating distinct traits and types by comparing or contrasting similar or opposing types, by isolating subtypes, and by analyzing their component factors or features.

Interest in theoretical character studies first appears in Aristotle, and all later ancient texts on the subject depend on him in one way or another. His approach to the subject must therefore be surveyed at the outset. The *Rhetoric* contains discussions of character in three separate contexts and from three distinct points of view. First, as Aristotle says in his introductions to Books 1 and 2, the ἦθος of the speaker is the most important of the three modes of persuasion (πίσταις), more important than either the disposition of the audience or the speech itself.¹¹ Thus, the speaker should present his own character in a way likely to estab-

of swearing and insulting, or to take a famous example from early Greek poetry, from Semonides' iambic mockery of the types of wives whose behavior and character derive from their alleged animal nature, such as a bitch, cat, or horse (fr. 7 West).

⁹ The correlation of physical beauty with good character, or conversely ugliness with villany, is the prevailing physiognomical interpretation in the Thersites scene in the *Iliad*. Yet elsewhere in the *Iliad* and even more so in the *Odyssey*, that correlation is challenged; cf. Archilochus' famous lines contrasting the athletic but vain general with the ugly but stout-hearted one (fr. 114 West). For further material on physiognomic thinking in early and classical Greek literature and art, see Vogt (1999) 45–107.

¹⁰ The notion of inference from signs invoked here is based on Peirce's doctrine of "semiosis" as "an action, or influence, which is, or involves, a cooperation of *three* subjects, such as a sign, its object, and its interpretant, this tri-relative influence not being in any way resolvable into actions between pairs" (1931–5) vol. 5, 484. The variety in the descriptions of behavioral and other signs for character types that appear in the sources here surveyed should not be surprising, if we take seriously Peirce's stress on the importance of the three subjects: correlations between signs and the character traits they signify have no independent status and always depend on the interpreter; they always lie in the eyes of the beholder.

¹¹ *Rhet.* 1.2 1356a1–11 and 2.1 1377b20–78a19.

lish his credibility: he will best persuade his audience if he displays his own wisdom, goodwill, and virtue all at once (2.1 1378a8–18).¹² Second, Book 2 surveys different kinds of character in the audience, envisioned as comprising men either young or old (2.12–14) and either lucky or unlucky in their fortune, birth, wealth, and power (2.15–17). Given these broad groups of disposition, speakers should appeal to the different susceptibilities of each group in order to persuade them.

The third consideration of character types in the *Rhetoric* is the account of emotional dispositions in Book 2.2–11. Its connection to the context is looser than in the two other cases (which explicitly focus on the speaker and the audience), and it was probably inserted here from another context, as W.W. Fortenbaugh has suggested.¹³ The choice and arrangement of terms in this list indicate an attempt to systematize the material. The list begins with three pairs of opposites: anger and mildness (ὀργή and πραότης, 1378a30–80a5 and 1380a6–b34), love and hatred (φιλία καὶ τὸ φιλεῖν and ἔχθρα καὶ τὸ μισεῖν, 1380b35–82a19), and fear and the daring (φόβος and οἱ θαρραλέοι, 1382a20–83a25 and 1383a25–b10). It reflects on how the structure of this list is getting looser, that already in the third pair Aristotle fails to couple terms of the same morphological type: φόβος, like the four terms treated before it, is an abstract noun, but its opposite is specified by an adjective, οἱ θαρραλέοι. The next two emotional types are described at length, but their opposites are only mentioned: shame (αἰσχύνη, 1383b11–85a14) and its counterpart, shamelessness (ἀναισχυντία), which is only cited as the opposite in a single clause (1385a14–5), then gratitude (χάρις, 1385a16–33) and its counterpart, ingratitude (ἀχάριστοι, in an adjectival form), also mentioned only in passing (1385a33–b10). For the last four types, the opposition is even more distorted: compassion (ἔλεος, 1385b11–86b7) has two counterparts, both resentment (τὸ νεμεσᾶν, 1386b8–15) and envy (φθόνος, 1386b16–88a30), which in turn are followed by another positive type, eagerness (ζήλος, 1388a31–b28). Despite this shifting structure, there are features common to every section: all start with definitions and investigate the motivations and reasoning behind the emotions as well as the situations in which they are felt. The

¹² The three qualities of a rhetor's character, as Fortenbaugh (1992) 211–20 points out, have a long tradition; they are what establish the credibility of Nestor and Calchas in the *Iliad*, and they have parallels in the requirements set for the rhetor in Plato's *Gorgias*.

¹³ Fortenbaugh (1996) 179–80.

definitions follow more or less the same pattern, in most cases introduced by ἔστω δὴ “may be defined”; thus the first: “Anger may be defined as a desire accompanied by pain, for revenge on account of a conspicuous slight at the hands of men who have no call to slight oneself or one’s relatives” (ἔστω δὴ ὀργὴ ὀρεξίς μετὰ λύπης τιμωρίας διὰ φαινομένην ὀλιγορίαν εἰς αὐτὸν ἢ <τι> τῶν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὀλιγορεῖν μὴ προσήκοντος, 1378a30–2).

Whereas the attempt to systematize the emotions in the *Rhetoric* is based on a scheme of opposites, the character types dealt with in the *Ethics* are based on a tripartite scheme of a mean between both excess and deficiency. The evaluation is always the same: both too much and too little are to be avoided as vices, and an intermediate state between the extremes is virtuous. The most comprehensive list is given in the *Nicomachean Ethics* 2.7 (1107a33–8b7),¹⁴ and it serves to display how virtue is best achieved: by hitting a mean.¹⁵ The descriptions and definitions given for the several character traits in Books 3.6–4.8 usually discuss both the concerns shared by each triad and the different attitudes each trait has toward those concerns (e.g., death for the cowardly, rash, and courageous). Aristotle not only describes the behavior of each character type in specific situations, he also explores the motivation underlying that behavior. Furthermore, his focus is on general types, not particular people: “although he personalises their bearers (exemplifying the δειλός and the ἀνδρεῖος, and so on . . .), his persons exist, for the most part, out of time and space, moral paradigms, not flesh and blood.”¹⁶ Aristotle thus employs both the conceptual and the inferential methods described above. Definition by verbal paraphrase is combined with contrasting oppositions in the *Rhetoric*, or scales of a mean and two extremes in the *Ethics*. In the former account, he implies that opposite character types exhibit very different behavior and motives,

¹⁴ See the tables in Rusten (1993) 13 and Diggle (2004) 6–7. Slightly different lists of the same format are given in *EE* 2.3 1220b21–21b3, *EE* 3, and *MM* 1.20–32.

¹⁵ Cf. especially 2.9 1109b23–6: “So much then is clear, that it is the middle disposition in each department of conduct that is to be praised, but that one should lean sometimes to the side of excess and sometimes to that of deficiency, since this is the easiest way of hitting the mean and the right course” (τὸ μὲν ἄρα τοσοῦτο δηλον ὅτι ἡ μέση ἕξις ἐν πᾶσιν ἐπαινετή, ἀποκλίνειν δὲ δεῖ ὅτε μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν ὅτε δ’ ἐπὶ τὴν ἑλλειψιν· οὕτω γὰρ ῥᾶστα τοῦ μέσου καὶ εὖ τευξόμεθα).

¹⁶ Diggle (2004) 7.

and in the latter, that character types in each triad exhibit similar concerns in very different ways.

The conceptual method is, of course, not restricted to character studies. Rather, as a linguistic and logical approach, it is applicable to a wide range of topics. Within the ancient Greek tradition, the conceptual method of definition by analysis and contrast of synonyms and antonyms was first practiced by Prodicus of Ceos,¹⁷ and it figures prominently in Plato's Socratic dialogues. It is also the main focus of the pseudo-Platonic *Definitions*. The method was especially popular in the Stoic tradition.¹⁸ A theoretical work that employs the conceptual approach exclusively is the short pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *On Virtues and Vices*.¹⁹ Probably composed in the early Peripatos around 300 BCE,²⁰ it arranges sixteen character traits or types into a schematic table of virtues (ἐπαινετά, τὰ καλά, αἱ ἀρεταί) and vices (ψεκτά, αἰσχροί, κακίαι) organized around the three Platonic parts of the soul (λογιστικόν, θυμοειδές and ἐπιθυμητικόν) and the "entire soul" (ὅλη ἡ ψυχή). The text has three sections: the first lists the sixteen character traits and assigns each to the category of virtue or vice and also to a part of the soul (1249a26–50a2); the second offers a definition for each trait (1250a3–29); and the third provides a brief description (1250a30–51b30). The definitions typically repeat the category and tell what results from acting in accordance with the trait; for example, "prudence [φρόνησις] is a virtue of the rational part [λογιστικόν], capable of procuring all that tends to happiness" (1250a3–4). The descriptions, on the other hand, summarize in very abstract terms the kinds of behavior that bring about the results specified in the definition; for example, "to prudence belongs right decision, right judgment as to what is good and bad and all in life that is to be chosen and avoided, noble use of all the goods that belong to us, correctness in social intercourse, a grasp of the right moment, the sagacious use of word and deed, the possession of experience of all that is useful; memory, experience, tact, good judgment, sagacity — each of these either arises from prudence or accompanies it" (1250a30–7). This last section, which recurs in this form for

¹⁷ Cf. Dumont (1986) and de Romilly (1986).

¹⁸ Not surprisingly, the Stoics apply the method among other topics also on character types, e.g. Chrysippus in *SVF* 3.95. This does not mean, however, that they are especially interested in character definition.

¹⁹ Cf. Schmidt (1986³).

²⁰ Schmidt (1986³) 26–8.

each character trait, is especially significant for our present discussion. For there the author lists a number of traits that accompany the main trait; sometimes one of these accompanying traits even recurs in a different section. Thus, for instance, truth (ἀλήθεια) accompanies both justice and magnanimity (1250b21 and 42), and both penny-pinching (μικρολογία) and humility (ταπεινότης) accompany both illiberality (ἀνελευθεριότης, 1251b14–6) and small-mindedness (μικροψυχία, 1251b24–5). Thus, *On Virtues and Vices* classifies character traits systematically according to both a bipartite scheme of virtue and vice and a Platonic tripartition of the soul, and its definitions specify both their distinctive motivations and various related traits. In short, the work seems to be concerned primarily with systematic classification and specification, and it provides a perfect example of an exclusively conceptual approach to character studies that omits all inferential aspects of the subject.

A very rudimentary form of this conceptual approach can be found in another pseudo-Aristotelian treatise from roughly the same period, around 300 BCE. The *Physiognomics* is a treatise in two parts on the theory and practice of inferring character traits from visible bodily features and comportment, and especially the face. The first part of the treatise contains a catalogue of twenty-two characters, with various bodily signs listed under each character trait. Each trait is simply named by a single word without any definition or description of its motives or behavior. The list starts with four pairs of opposites: the brave man and the coward (ἀνδρείος and δειλός, 807a31–b12), the naturally clever and the insensitive man (εὐφυής and ἀναίσθητος, 807b12–28), the shameless and the orderly man (ἀναιδής and κόσμιος, 807b28–8a1), and the high-spirited and the low-spirited man (εὐθυμος and ἄθυμος, 808a2–11). The two that follow are not of opposites but wholly unrelated, and they seem to be coupled only because each lacks a counterpart of its own: the “kinaidos” (κίναϊδος, 808a12) and the sour man (πικρός, 808a17). The next two again form a pair of opposites: the passionate and the gentle man (θυμώδης and πραύς, 808a19–27). The list then continues with a rather extraordinary assortment of ten further types: the ironical man (εἴρων, 808a27–9), the small-minded man (μικροψυχος, 808a29–31), gamblers (φιλόκυβοι, 808a31–2), abusive people (φιλολοίδοροι, 808a32–3), compassionate people (ἐλεήμονες, 808a33–b3), those with good appetite (ἀγαθοὶ φαγεῖν, 808b2–4), the lecherous man (λαγνός, 808b4–6), the somnolent (φίλυπνοι, 808b6–

8), talkers (λαλοί, 808b8), and those with good memory (μνήμονες, 808b9–10). Clearly, the second half of the list shows no interest in systematization; its apparent aim is rather to include all sorts of diverse material. Another interesting feature is that morally negative characters are much more frequent than positive ones – though there are also some types that appear to be morally neutral and strictly physical conditions: good appetite, good memory, and sleepiness.

A similar lack of order is even more evident in the text most relevant for comparison with Aristo, the *Characters* of Theophrastus. Its list of thirty character types runs as follows:²¹ the dissembler (ὁ εἴρων), the toady (ὁ κόλαξ), the chatterbox (ὁ ἀδολέσχης), the country bumkin (ὁ ἄγροικος), the obsequious man (ὁ ἄρεσκος), the man who has lost all sense (ὁ ἀπονεινομένος), the talker (ὁ λόλος), the rumor-monger (ὁ λογοποιός), the shameless man (ὁ ἀναίσχυντος), the penny-pincher (ὁ μικρολόγος), the repulsive man (ὁ βδελυρός), the tactless man (ὁ ἄκαιρος), the overzealous man (ὁ περίεργος), the obtuse man (ὁ ἀναίσθητος), the self-centered man (ὁ αὐθάδης), the superstitious man (ὁ δεισιδαίμων), the ungrateful grumbler (ὁ μεμψίμοιρος), the distrustful man (ὁ ἄπιστος), the offensive man (ὁ δυσχερής), the disagreeable man (ὁ ἀηδής), the man of petty ambition (ὁ μικροφιλότιμος), the illiberal man (ὁ ἀνελεύθερος), the boastful man (ὁ ἀλαζών), the arrogant man (ὁ ὑπερήφανος), the coward (ὁ δειλός), the oligarchic man (ὁ ὀλιγαρχικός), the late learner (ὁ ὀψιμαθής), the slanderer (ὁ κακολόγος), the friend of villains (ὁ φιλοπόνηρος), and the shabby profiteer (ὁ αἰσχροκερδής). Obviously, there is no attempt to organize this material in ways that would contribute to defining each character type by establishing relations of opposites or subtypes. Such an attempt would have been difficult in any case, given the selection of types: since they are exclusively negative traits, any pairing with positive opposites or a grouping by gradations would have been impossible. Theophrastus seems to be uninterested in either comprehensiveness or definitions — for the introductory definitions in each sketch are later

²¹ I adapt Diggle's (2004) translations.

²² The authenticity of most of them has been refuted by Stein (1992). Diggle (2004) 17 is right in going further and rejecting all the definitions, on the ground that if some of them have been proved false and none has been proved authentic, the close similarity is enough to refute all of them: "They have the same stamp . . . they stand and fall together."

interpolations.²² The *Characters* is thus an example of a purely inferential approach to character study, and therefore the exact opposite of *On Virtues and Vices*.

To sum up the results of this survey of the Peripatetic tradition, Aristotle's treatment of ἦθος in the *Poetics* and *Rhetoric* discusses character as the external manifestation of underlying resolutions (προαίρεσεις), and his *Ethics* presents character as a set of dispositions in the non-rational part of the soul that tend to follow the decisions of reason.²³ Thus, he is interested in observable behavior insofar as it is connected to some underlying but unobservable motivations and decisions.²⁴ His is mainly an inferential approach that focuses on internal — and therefore in themselves invisible — signs of motivations and reasons in the soul. In sharp contrast, Theophrastus in the *Characters* is not at all concerned with the motivations or reasons for behavior; he focuses solely on what William Fortenbaugh calls “superficial behavioral regularities”: “Theophrastus describes what a given type of person is likely to do, without telling us why the person does what he does.”²⁵ This is again an inferential approach, but one focused entirely on external signs offered by observed behavior. Moreover, by choosing everyday situations as background for the behavioral traits, Theophrastus makes his text readily intelligible to his audience. The actions of his fictitious stereotypes can be observed on the street, in the *agora*, in the theater, or in the baths; and conclusions concerning the underlying character are thus easy to draw. However, in Aristotle the conceptual approach is also firmly established: each of the types discussed receives a definition, partly by being related to other traits and partly by paraphrase. The two pseudo-Aristotelian treatises, *On Virtues and Vices* and *Physiognomics*, are not concerned with overt behavior at all, and they use character types as mere labels. *On Virtues and Vices*, which classifies and correlates types by means of definitions and clusters of synonyms and antonyms, relies solely on a conceptual approach. The *Physiognomics*, on the other hand, which simply lists types and their correlative bodily signs, relies solely on an inferential approach.

²³ Cf. *EE* 1220b5–6.

²⁴ For the relation between “character” and “intellect” in Aristotle, cf. Blundell (1992). For Aristotle's notion of *ēthos*, see Schütrumpf (1970) and (1993).

²⁵ Fortenbaugh (1994) 16; cf. Fortenbaugh (1975).

III

After our survey of similar material, the apparently strange structure of Aristo's work on characters begins to make sense. In the first part quoted by Philodemus, where Aristo gives advice on how to relieve arrogant behavior in specific situations, his approach is rather anecdotal. I shall not deal with the content of that advice, since its philosophical basis is discussed by Voula Tsouna in this volume. After this initial section, Philodemus quotes Aristo for his work in distinguishing different character traits or types. In this section, Aristo combines both methods found in earlier Peripatetic work, both the inferential method of isolating superficial behavioral regularities, and the conceptual approach of defining traits by ways of opposites and synonyms, and subtypes and blends. In the material recounted in direct speech (**21g.29–21o.21**), this method becomes very clear. Aristo first (**21g.35–21j.2**) gives sketches of the behavior of the inconsiderate man (αὐθάδης), the self-willed man (αὐθέκαστος) and the “know-it-all” (παντειδήμων); he then discusses the consequences of such behavior for each of the three types in the same order (**21j.2–21k.32**). After a brief note on the relation between the arrogant man (ὑπερήφανος) and the disdainful man (ὑπερόπτης, **21k.32–21l.4**), Aristo continues along the same lines in discussing the specific features of “the man affecting solemnity” (σεμνοκόπος, **21l.4–14**), the “swaggerer” (βρενθυόμενος, **21l.14–38**), and in a rather long paragraph, the ironic man or dissembler (εἴρων, **21l.38–21n.37**). In the last paragraph cited by Philodemus (**21o.1–21**), the four similar and interrelated types of the disparager and utter disparager (εὐτελιστής and ἐξευτελιστής), the vilifier and utter vilifier (οὐδενωτής and ἐξουδενωτής) are briefly distinguished from each other according to the intensity of their abusive behavior. This structure itself indicates Aristo's clever use of the conceptual method: he presents a broad picture of several related character types, all of which he treats as subtypes of arrogance, thereby both providing a more substantial survey of the diverse aspects of arrogance and distinguishing its several subtypes.²⁶

Both in the overall structure of the text and in its specific sections, Aristo's skilful combination of the conceptual and inferential ap-

²⁶ This conceptual interpretation of the structure is, in my view, a strong argument in favor of the unity of the source used by Philodemus; cf. above, sec. I.

proaches is evident. Especially revealing in this regard is one of his definitions of the arrogant man in the initial section of Philodemus' paraphrase (21e.7–15):

ὁ γὰρ ὑπερήφανος οὔτε συνπαραληπτικός ἐτέρων, ἅμα μὲν ὑπ' οἰήσεως, ἅμα δὲ διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερφρονεῖν, ἅν τε παρακαλῇ, χαλεπὸς ὑπακούειν διὰ τε τὴν ἄλλην ἀηδίαν καὶ διὰ τὸ τὰς πράξεις ἐξιδιάζεσθαι θέλειν, εἴτ' ἀσυνέργητος ὢν.

For the arrogant person tends not to call in the help of others, partly from self-conceit, partly because he looks down on the others, and if he does call [them] in for help, he finds it difficult to heed advice, both because he is hard to please anyway and especially on account of wishing to claim the actions as his own, thus being impossible to cooperate with.

Aristo alternates between describing behavioral patterns and the psychological motivation behind them. This alternation is underlined by the syntactic structure: the behavioral patterns are all indicated by adjectival phrases (οὔτε συνπαραληπτικός ἐτέρων — χαλεπὸς ὑπακούειν — ἀσυνέργητος ὢν), and the explanations are always introduced by διὰ. Thus, Aristo skilfully combines the conceptual and inferential approaches.

The character sketches in the second part of Philodemus' quotations exhibit a similar union of conceptual definition and inferential interpretation. Aristo typically provides first a definition and then a number of behavioral sketches. Witness his sketch of the self-centered man (αὐθάδης, 21g.29–21h.17): “The person said (to be) self-centered seems to be a blend of conceit, arrogance and disdain [μεικτὸς ἐξ οἰήσεως καὶ ὑπερηφανίας καὶ ὑπεροψίας], along with a large dose of thoughtlessness [μετέχων δὲ καὶ πολλῆς εἰκαιότητος]. He is the kind, Aristo says, to demand hot or cold water in the bath without first asking his fellow-bather whether it is all right with him too . . .” (I omit the six further behavior sketches in different situations). Aristo supplies the conceptual definition by naming the four components of self-centeredness. He then goes on to describe behavioral patterns open to inferences, very much in the style of Theophrastus. After defining the trait, Aristo discusses the consequences of its behavior (21j.3–17): “[The behavior] of the self-centered person, then, is attended by the vexatious consequences arising from his conceit and his arrogance and his disdain [τὰ τ' ἐκ τῆς οἰήσεως καὶ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας καὶ

ὑπερωΐας], if not his boastfulness as well [καὶ τῆς ἀλαζονείας], and in his particular case, by those arising from his thoughtlessness and those occasioned by the anger of the people towards whom he behaves in this manner.” Aristo thus refers back to all three of the primary components mentioned in the definition.

IV

To conclude my analysis, I shall look more closely at Aristo’s account of two character types. This will also show how thoroughly Aristo is embedded in the Peripatetic tradition. I have chosen to look at arrogance and irony, because these also feature in Theophrastus and Aristotle.

Aristo points out that ὑπερηφανία and μεγαλοψυχία should be distinguished (21f.22–4). He appears to refer to Aristotle’s tripartite distinction in *Nicomachean Ethics* 4.3 between μεγαλοψυχία as the mean between the deficiency of μικροψυχία and the excess of χαυνότης. The latter is much closer to the mean than μικροψυχία, which is virtually the opposite of both. For both the μεγαλόψυχος and the χαῦνος regard themselves as worthy of the best; the crucial difference is that the magnanimous man is right in doing so, and the vain or arrogant man is not.²⁷ Wilhelm Knögel has shown the close parallels in content and phrasing in the description and definition of arrogance in Aristotle and Aristo, and also in Theophrastus’ *Character* 24, the ὑπερήφανος.²⁸ Although the vocabulary differs slightly, the conception of arrogance is largely the same in all three works. What Theophrastus and Aristo call ὑπερηφανία appears to be χαυνότης in Aristotle. A central feature of this type is contempt, which Aristotle and Theophrastus perceive in similar terms: “they do not act virtuously [sc. as the magnanimous do] but show their contempt for others (καταφρονοῦσι τῶν ἄλλων)” (*EN* 1124b4) could be read as a summary of several of the behavioral patterns of Theophrastus’ arrogant man, culminating in offending his guests: “When he gives a dinner for his friends he does not dine with them but tells one of his employees to look after them.” (*Char.* 24.9). The definition preceding the sketch, though not by Theophrastus, aptly

²⁷ Cf. Arist. *EN* 4.3 1123b1–9: δοκεῖ δὲ μεγαλόψυχος εἶναι ὁ μεγάλων αὐτὸν ἀξιῶν ἄξιος ὢν ... ὁ δὲ μεγάλων ἐαντὸν ἀνάξιος ὢν χαῦνος.

²⁸ Cf. Knögel (1933) 17–25.

uses the same term as Aristotle (albeit a noun rather than the verb): “arrogance is a sort of contempt for anyone other than oneself (καταφρόνησις τις πλὴν αὐτοῦ τῶν ἄλλων)” (*Char.* 24.1). Aristo expresses the same behavior with the verb ὑπερορᾶν.²⁹ The abstract noun derived from this verb, ὑπεροψία, appears as a prominent trait of the arrogant man in both Aristotle and Aristo.³⁰ Hence, despite slight variations in terminology, the basic conception of arrogance is largely the same in all three authors.

The εἴρων is also an instructive case, because it shows that we should not expect to find exactly the same ideas within the same school, but rather some different evaluations due to contemporary ideas and values. The εἴρων was originally considered a pretender, until Socrates was adopted as the prototype of the ironic man by Plato and other Socratics. Their picture of εἰρωνεία as false modesty was largely positive. In both Theophrastus and Aristo, however, the trait has a more negative value. For them, εἰρωνεία is essentially dissimulating in order to avoid candid speech and the consequences it might entail. Thus, the εἴρων regularly acts contrary to what people expect. Yet his actions are in part predictable, since he practices dissimulation in order to flatter people. In Theophrastus’ first *Character*, the dissembler appears to be entirely negative. But in Aristo, he is blended with positive ideas derived from Socratic irony; Socrates is even mentioned by name near the end of the surviving excerpt on irony (**21m.36**), apparently to provide some examples. A phrase in Aristo’s account of the dissembler also appears to go back to Socrates: “If one praises him, or bids him speak, or people say that he will be remembered, he responds, ‘What am I supposed to know, except that I know nothing?’ [ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶδα τί πλὴν γε τούτου, ὅτι οὐδὲν οἶδα]” (**21m.20–2**).³¹

The εἴρων thus illustrates how two very different ideas of dissembling can clash: the popular idea of feigning out of egotistical calculations, and the specifically Socratic irony with its positive implications for the deeper philosophic truth that Socrates’ followers saw in him. We need not be surprised that both Theophrastus and Aristo fail to follow Aristotle’s positive account of Socratic εἰρωνεία, or that Aristo uses

²⁹ Aristo **21e.10**: τὸ τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερορᾶν and **21f.32**: τὸ ὑπερορᾶν ἑτέρους.

³⁰ Arist. *EN* 1124a19, Aristo **21g.31–2** and **21j.4** (both passages quoted above in this section).

³¹ The reference is to Socrates in Plato, *Apology* 21D: ἔοικα γοῦν τούτου γε μικρῶ τι νι αὐτῷ τούτῳ σοφώτερος εἶναι, ὅτι ἄ μὴ οἶδα οὐδὲ οἶομαι εἰδέναι.

Socrates as a negative example for εἰρωνεία – something Aristotle would hardly have done. But we are reminded by the *Tractatus Coislinianus* 12 that the ironical man is a stock character of comedy, alongside the buffoon and the boaster.³² That seems plausible enough, according to what we know about character types in Middle and New Comedy, and it also matches the characters in Old Comedy. In Aristophanes' *Clouds* 449, for instance, the ironical man and the boaster appear together. Yet the juxtaposition of the buffoon, the ironical man and the boaster also brings us back to Aristotle. Richard Janko, in his commentary on the *Tractatus Coislinianus*,³³ points out that all three types are discussed – usually in opposing pairs – several times in Aristotle (*EN* 2.7 and 4.7–8, *Rhet.* 3.18 1419b6–9).³⁴ The *Rhetoric* states that “irony is more respectable than buffoonery, since the former makes the joke for his own benefit, but the buffoon to please another.” The boaster, on the other hand, aims to impress rather than to amuse. Thus, *EN* 2.7 defines boasting and irony as the excess and deficiency of pretension, and *EN* 4.7 deems the boaster worse for being opposed to the truthful man (1127b31–2). Socratic irony is also seen as a more positive trait, since its aim in missing the truth is to avoid pompousness (1127b20–4). Aristo thus appears to combine two conceptions of irony which are not really compatible: the popular notion found in comedy, and the idiosyncratic notion of Socratic irony found in Plato and also in Aristotle, albeit in altered form.

It would be interesting, but impossible here, to examine the ironical man³⁵ and Aristo's other character types in the context of Peripatetic moral philosophy and the literary and socio-cultural background of his era. I hope, however, to have shown how closely Aristo is bound to the Peripatetic tradition of moral evaluation and its use of both conceptual and inferential approaches to character study. A detailed study of the several character types in Aristo against this wider background remains a desideratum. My aim has been only to provide a preliminary sketch.³⁶

³² *Tract. Coislinianus* 12: ἡθὴ κωμωδίας τὰ τε βωμολόχα καὶ τὰ εἰρωνικά καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀλαζόνων; see Janko (1984) 39.

³³ Janko (1984) 216–18.

³⁴ The contrast drawn between buffoonery and boorishness in *EN* 4 occurs with different details in *EE* 3.7 1233b38–34a3; cf. Fortenbaugh (1981).

³⁵ For further material from Greek literature on the ironical man, see Vogt (1999) 381–4 and Diggle (2004) 166–7.

³⁶ This article would not have been written without the encouragement and sup-

Works Cited

- Blundell, M. W. 1992. "Êthos and Dianoia Reconsidered," in *Essays on Aristotle's Poetics*, ed. A. O. Rorty (Princeton: Princeton University Press), 155–75
- de Romilly, J. 1986. "Les manies de Prodicos et la rigueur de la langue grecque," *Museum Helveticum* 43: 1–18.
- Diggle, J. 2004. *Theophrastus: Characters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Dumont, J.-P. 1986. "Prodicos, de la méthode au système," in *Positions de la sophistique: Colloque de Cerisy*, ed. B. Cassin (Paris: Vrin), 221–32.
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. 1975. "Die Charaktere Theophrasts: Verhaltensregelmässigkeiten und aristotelische Laster," *Rheinisches Museum* 118: 62–82.
- — —. 1981. "Theophrast über den komischen Charakter," *Rheinisches Museum* 124: 245–60.
- — —. 1992. "Aristotle on Persuasion Through Character," *Rhetorica* 10: 207–44.
- — —. 1994. "Theophrastus, the *Characters* and Rhetoric," in *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*, ed. by W. W. Fortenbaugh and D. C. Mirhady (New Brunswick: Transaction), 15–35.
- — —. 1996. "On the Composition of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*: Arguing the Issue, Emotional Appeal, Persuasion through Character, and Characters Tied to Age and Fortune," in *AHNAIKA: Festschrift für Carl Werner Müller*, ed. C. Müller-Goldingen and K. Sier (Stuttgart and Leipzig: B.G. Teubner), 165–88.
- Janko, R. 1984. *Aristotle on Comedy: Towards a Reconstruction of "Poetics" II* (London: Duckworth).
- Jensen, C. 1911. "Ariston von Keos bei Philodem," *Hermes* 46: 393–406.
- Knögel, W. 1933. *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem* (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz).
- Peirce, C. S. 1931–5. *Collected Papers*, vols. 1–6, ed. C. Hartshorne and P. Weiss (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

port of Bill Fortenbaugh and Stephen White, who also considerably improved my English. I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to both of them. All remaining errors are, of course, mine.

- Rusten, J. 1993. *Theophrastus: Characters*, in ed. J. Rusten, I. C. Cunningham, A. D. Knox (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Schmidt, E. A. 1986³. *Aristoteles: Über die Tugend* = Aristoteles Werke in deutscher Übersetzung, vol. 18.1 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag).
- Schütrumpf, E. 1970. *Die Bedeutung des Wortes êthos in der Poetik des Aristoteles* (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung).
- — —. 1993. "The Model for the Concept of 'Ethos' in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*," *Philologus* 137: 12–17.
- Stein, M. 1992. *Definition und Schilderung in Theophrasts Charakteren* (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner).
- Vogt, S. 1999. *Ps.-Aristoteles: Physiognomonica* = Aristoteles Werke in deutscher Übersetzung, vol. 18.6 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag).
- Wehrli, F. 1952/1968. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 6: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (Basel: Schwabe).

6

Aristo on Blends of Arrogance

Voula Tsouna

There is no doubt at all that, in the composition of his treatise *On Arrogance*, Philodemus borrows heavily from Aristo. He mentions him by his first name and, although he does not identify him further, it seems to me very likely that the philosopher in question is the Peripatetic Aristo from Ceos, not the Stoic Aristo from Chios.¹ The first explicit

¹ An argument to the contrary is made by Ioppolo (1996). The chief grounds on which she shifted from her earlier position, defended in Ioppolo (1980), to the one maintained in her later publication are the following. First, the treatment of the εἴρων attributed to Aristo in the treatise *On Arrogance* differs from the analyses of the εἴρων offered by Aristotle and by Theophrastus. While the former constitutes a negative characterisation, the latter are by and large positive, setting the εἴρων in contrast to the ἀλαζών. Besides, while *On Arrogance* presents Socrates as the embodiment of the εἴρων, Theophrastus does not allude to him. Nor is there any other Peripatetic who treats Socrates in the negative way in which *On Arrogance* discusses him. In general, Ioppolo contends, the characterology of the arrogant types in *On Arrogance* contains moral evaluations, whereas Peripatetic characterology mostly does not, but rather aims at giving rise to laughter. On the other hand, the Stoic treatment of human characters does have moral dimensions, very much so when it comes to the patron saint of the Stoic school, Socrates. Aristo of Chios in particular has great admiration for Socrates, with the qualification that this is not the εἴρων Socrates of the Platonic dialogues, but the Socrates of Xenophon, whose portrait is transmitted to the Stoics via Antisthenes.

reference to Aristo is found in the context of a discussion intended to dispel the impression that the wise man is affected by arrogance. At the outset, Philodemus corrects Aristo's assumption that good fortune is the principal source of the vice by pointing out that the practice of philosophy constitutes an additional reason on account of which some people may appear arrogant; Heraclitus, Pythagoras, Empedocles and Socrates are notorious cases at hand (10.10–25). All the same, however, Philodemus subsequently undertakes to summarise the substance of Aristo's "book of letters" (ἐπι[στ]ολ[ικά], 10.12–13).² He describes the strategies that Aristo proposes for the therapy of the vice³ and corroborates them with examples extracted from a recognisably Peripatetic stock.

The next occurrence of Aristo's name is found at the beginning of the exposition of various types of arrogant men. The expression "as Aristo says" (φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων, 16.34) indicates that, in this instance, Philodemus quotes rather than paraphrases him. This fact is confirmed by the closing sentence of the treatise: "Here we shall end this memorandum from him [sc. Aristo] and we shall append to it the memoran-

In presenting Socrates as the embodiment of the εἴρων, Aristo aims to stigmatize as vicious not the historical Socrates, but Plato's interpretation of an aporetic Socrates endorsed also by Arcesilaus. Ioppolo's thesis has some plausibility but is, I think, incorrect. For it seems that not all the Peripatetics have a positive image of Socrates. Nor do all Stoics object to Plato's interpretation of Socrates but, in fact, often appeal to it in order to defend their Socratic pedigree. In particular, it is not clear to me that Aristotle's analysis of the εἴρων (*EN* 4.7) excludes a relatively bad characterisation of Socrates. True, Aristotle does say that ironical people who understate things, as Socrates used to do, seem more attractive than boasters. But he refrains from praising them, including Socrates, as much as the truthful man. Furthermore, Aristotle's analysis of the role of good fortune in the development of pride (*EN* 4.3) resembles closely Aristo's analysis in *On Arrogance*. And Theophrastus' description of the proud man has features encountered also in Aristo's descriptions of arrogant types. For detailed discussion of this issue, see Dorandi, Hahm, Ranocchia, and Vogt in this volume. An entirely different interpretation, according to which the εἴρων depicted in *On Arrogance* comes from Epicurean sources, is defended by Kleve (1983), but convincingly refuted by Ioppolo (1996) 729 n. 44.

² The word ἐπι[στ]ολ[ικά] (10.12–13) is a new reading by Gigante (1997), which establishes that *On Arrogance* had an epistolary form. See Dorandi's discussion on this point, as well as his provisional reconstruction and translation of col. 10.10–30, in this volume. A survey of the scholarship concerning col. 10.10–30 is found in Ranocchia in this volume.

³ See Tsouna (2001) and below.

dum concerning the other vices which we are trying to treat” (24.31–7). The quotation in question runs for approximately eight columns (16.33–24.37) and constitutes the main, though not the only, subject of my paper.

First, I shall situate Aristo’s views in the broader context of a systematic exploration of the vice. I shall sketch out the steps of the analysis of arrogance proposed by Philodemus’ treatise and I shall show where and why the references to Aristo’s work are philosophically apposite.⁴ Second, I shall discuss Aristo’s concept of blends. I shall focus on the relation between arrogance and other vicious characteristics in each blend and I shall outline its formal structure. Third, I shall argue that Aristo’s analysis of certain types of arrogance in terms of vicious blends contains plausible intuitions and is of considerable philosophical interest in its own right. I shall conclude that the Peripatetic philosopher gives us a better understanding of the reasons why arrogance is a fundamentally distorting human characteristic and, hence, why we should seek to cure or avoid it altogether.

I

The treatise *On Arrogance* defines the vice as a dispositional state (διόθεσις) whose central characteristics are disdain and offensive pride.⁵ It affects the agent as well as other people, whom the agent considers suitable objects of his arrogance and “for whom he reserves” it (6.30–2). And it is typically manifested in behavior and action. “Prompted by a certain disposition” (ἀπὸ τῆς διαθέσεως, 21.20–2), the haughty person “looks down upon everybody, views them with disapproval, shakes his head and belittles with ridicule the people that he encounters or those mentioned in his presence” (21.22–7).⁶ Although the

⁴ Methodologically, I assume that the views that Philodemus advances in cols. 1.1–10.10 of the treatise belong to Philodemus or to earlier Epicureans, but that they are compatible with Aristo’s views. As to the positions presented from col. 10.10 onwards, they are mainly Aristo’s and they are endorsed by Philodemus for his own purposes.

⁵ See the definition of the arrogant man as “the man who appears disdainful (καταφρονητικός) both with regard to all those for whom he reserves his arrogance and through his actions, and moreover the kind of person who is generally hybriatic” (ὕβρισ[τή]ς, 6.27–34).

⁶ So the arrogant man both *appears* (φαίνόμενος) disdainful and *acts* like somebody who has feelings of disdain towards others (6.28–32).

meaning of “disposition” (διάρθροσις) is not clarified in that context, it is fairly clear that the term refers to an inner state which is content-sensitive, i.e., it implies reactions to situations as these are perceived by the agent and, therefore, has intentionality in that limited sense. Thus, in particular circumstances, the arrogant type tends to feel and behave in certain ways which are related to his perception of his own superiority and of the inferiority of others.

The sense of superiority of the arrogant person is grounded on clusters of beliefs. Several of them may have a factual basis, no matter how tenuous, and all of them typically reflect his inflated perception of his own status, skills and talents.⁷ However, arrogance is not merely a matter of having a high opinion about one’s abilities, even if this opinion is entirely groundless. It moreover entails forming a high opinion about oneself, i.e., about one’s superiority as a human being.⁸ Indeed, Philodemus suggests, probably following Aristo, that the haughty person owes his pride not simply to his belief that he is an expert in domains in which others are not, but also to the additional assumption that he surpasses everybody else in precisely those areas that are relevant to the good life. Knowledge and even polymathy, sound judgement, self-sufficiency, and a certain type of bearing and behavior⁹ illustrate this “virtue-theoretic”¹⁰ sense of superiority on account of which the arrogant man perceives himself as meeting best the standards of goodness, and hence as being a most perfect instance of humanity.

Notwithstanding its strictly personal aspects, arrogance has an essentially interpersonal dimension. This occupies a prominent place in the writings of both Aristo and Philodemus. For they highlight many ways in which arrogance constitutes a particularly vicious manner of assessing and interacting with other people. First of all, the vice is marked by the development of relational attitudes and beliefs, which often involve

⁷ For instance, the arrogant man considers himself more important than other people “if he gets hold of some position of power” (5.8–9), if he does accomplish some major deed (4.27–30) or if he happens to render some small service (5.11–12). Moreover, his sense of superiority may derive from the beliefs that his talent is such as to ensure future success (14.24–36), that he knows more than other people and is more capable than they are (14.7–11), that in truth he alone has any sense at all (17.20–2), that asking for advice is a sign of weakness and immaturity (17.23–4, 18.3–10), or worse, that he is entirely self-sufficient since he is an expert in every subject (18.11 ff.).

⁸ On this point, see Tiberius and Walker (1998).

⁹ See, for instance, 8.8–14.

¹⁰ See Tiberius and Walker (1998) 380.

pairs of causally related polar opposites. The arrogant man sees himself as superior and other people as inferior. He believes himself to be better in various things and others to be worse. He views philosophers with disdain, because he considers that he is so supremely wise that they have nothing to teach him (4.22–6). His “insurmountable disgust” (ἀνυπέρβατος ἀηδία, 8.3–4) of others is causally related to an excessive appreciation of his own nobility (8.11–12). His disparagement of them is coupled with admiration for himself (9.1–4, 10–11). And so on.

By construing human relationships as hierarchical and non-reciprocal, the arrogant man does more than merely offend the objects of his disdain. He also corrodes the social fabric to which he belongs. This effect is particularly noticeable in his attitudes towards relatives, dependants, acquaintances, and collaborators. For the vice renders us unable to desire genuinely the welfare of other people and to act in ways that might promote it. Moreover, it obstructs the feelings of gratitude and the wish to reciprocate that we might have naturally developed towards people who have assisted us in a kind and disinterested manner.¹¹

The complete distortion of interpersonal relationships is, interestingly, the main reason on account of which arrogance should be considered irrational.¹² Its irrationality is strikingly obvious in the agent’s refusal to acknowledge the value of others as human beings and to treat them as his equals in this respect. “He does not mistreat whichever animals he happens to be living with, for instance [horses], dogs and other such animals but, by contrast, he mistreats man, a being so very different from animals and most akin to himself in virtue of the fact that he has been adorned [with reason]” (15.33–40). What is more, the vice can carry one away to the point of extinguishing reason altogether. Aristo’s examples of Xerxes yoking the Hellespont and of those taking themselves to be gods illustrate the point (16.15–27).

¹¹ Thus, in contrast to the good person, the arrogant man does not “[give thanks for benefits]” (9.14–17) in the conviction that “he honors (his benefactors) greatly because he has accepted something from them” (9.17–20). On the other hand, he always tries to make sure that he will be rewarded for any service or favor that he may render, especially to people more wealthy or powerful than he is (9.24–5). All such reactions, originate from the sense of superiority of the arrogant person and from his fundamental incapacity to relate to others in a reciprocal manner.

¹² Here, the concept of irrationality at work is grounded in the eudaemonistic presupposition that no rational being opts willingly for what is bad for him or herself, and also the conviction that vice compels us to act against our own good, bringing upon ourselves unhappiness and ruin.

Connected to the irrationality of arrogance is the lack of self-knowledge.¹³ This constitutes a buffer which keeps at a safe distance whatever might undermine the self-importance and sense of superiority of the arrogant man, and which encourages self-deception and pretense. So, as Philodemus points out, the arrogant man can tell himself that his illiberal treatment of other people is in fact dictated by his sense of justice (2.1–33). He can remain oblivious to the indecency and inelegance of his own behavior (5.5–6). And, as Aristo remarks, he can divert the ridicule heaped upon himself to the ignorance of his fellow-men (18.37–8). Both authors suggest that obtuseness towards oneself, perhaps more than any other feature of arrogance, renders the eradication of the vice a particularly difficult task.

Arrogance, manifested in the lack of self-knowledge and in the distortion of interpersonal relations, seriously affects areas of human activity that involve decision-making and cooperation. Asking for advice and help in areas in which we find ourselves unequal to our task implies the belief that others may have knowledge, experience, good judgment, intuition, or connections which we ourselves do not have. It also implies that we shall not consider our pride wounded, our self-esteem lost or our self-image affected merely because we have had to ask for help. We focus instead on the decision that needs to be made or the work that needs to be done, and we seek to use all the help we can get in order to bring the matter to completion as efficiently as possible. On the other hand, persons tainted by arrogance are dispositionally unable to feel and act in that manner.

The arrogant man is not capable of asking people for advice, partly because of self-conceit, partly because he feels contempt towards others; and if he is urged to ask for advice, he finds it difficult to obey, both because of other reasons for his disgust and because he wants to give credit to himself for the things that have been achieved, and then remains unassisted. [14.7–15]

Excessive self-confidence and the lack of cooperative virtues are indeed particularly noticeable in Aristo's characters, especially in the types of the self-willed man and of the man-who-knows-all. The former is "self-opinionated, because he believes that he alone has any sense and is confident that he will be successful in everything" (17.19–22).

¹³ If the reading [τοὺς οὐδ'] ἐν συνειδότας [ἑαυτοῖς] is correct, this point is explicitly made in fr. 1.

And further, “he claims that those who seek the advice of others, as if these were their tutors, are still little children, and that he is in fact the only one to have a beard and grey hair and to be able to survive if he were left on his own” (18.5–11). As to the man-who-knows-all, he justifies his polymathy by appealing to the authority of his expert teachers, as much as to his own observational powers and his inventiveness (18.12–18), and consequently “he [disgraces] himself by laying claim to [all] disciplines” (18.35–7).

Now, there is an external factor causally connected to arrogance and occasionally obstructing its therapy, namely luck. As mentioned above, Aristo’s name and the critical use of his work occurs for the first time in connection with that subject. He points out that the arrogant man tends to show disdain for the victims of bad fortune and, on the other hand, to take great pride in the advantages that come to him from his own good fortune (10.10–15, 13.34–8, 15.29–33),¹⁴ often boasting aloud about them in order to make them look even greater than in truth they are (11.24–7).¹⁵ If we ask ourselves what makes these attitudes particularly repulsive, we shall probably come up with an answer which incorporates Aristo’s intuitions on this matter. Taking pride over the advantages coming from sheer luck, although pathetic, might perhaps be forgiven. But looking down upon others on the occasion of sufferings which are beyond their control seems inexcusable and indeed cruel.¹⁶

¹⁴ It is worth noticing that Aristo’s writing on the suppression of arrogance is focused exclusively on people who are arrogant on account of their good fortune (10.14–15). This, as well as Philodemus’ discussion, indicates that many ancient thinkers consider good luck the most important cause of arrogance. One reason for this, I suggest, is the connection that they trace between arrogance and *hubris*.

¹⁵ Remarks concerning the relation between arrogance and luck are also found in 5.1ff. and 9.4–5.

¹⁶ Given the moral dimensions that the arrogant person attaches to luck, Philodemus is probably correct in claiming that absence of adversities also undermines the hope of curing the vice. “I am afraid that, since foolishness occurs in those who are arrogant on account of their luck, the arrogant person, far from setting himself right in order to become wise, may not even need to change his frame of mind” (5.19–26). On the other hand, precisely because their sense of superiority depends on an external and unpredictable factor, arrogant people are vulnerable to the turns of fortune. “Sometimes they are arrogant, whereas other times they turn humble and sinking on their knees ... sometimes indeed changing their behavior in respect of the very things about which they have been filled with conceit, and therefore falling asunder in their presumptions” (7.15–25). And again, “one must take into account that, when the arrogant person is stripped of glorious good fortune, he will pull down his pride and will appear in the

Despite the obstacles that the absence of self-knowledge and the turns of fortune raise with regard to the therapy of arrogance, Philodemus recommends that we should not despair of it. The strategies that he proposes for its cure are, in fact, Aristo's own. Although we do not share many of his assumptions and we no more consider philosophy as a therapeutic enterprise, nonetheless we may find some pragmatic interest in surveying these devices for removing arrogance.¹⁷

One technique is to learn to humble ourselves when we have reason to boast and, conversely, to boost ourselves up at times when we feel demoralised (11.24–33). Another is that a person should “[measure] himself not against those who are [poorer] but against those who surpass him in every single aspect, since the former practice exalts and the latter humbles” (12.4–9). A third strategy consists in comparing ourselves with truly great men who appear that much greater because they used to behave with simplicity, humanity, and sympathy (13.8–30). A fourth one is to recall cases of important men who dealt arrogantly with people and thus “drew difficulties to themselves because of one single harsh word” (13.25–30). A fifth is to keep constantly in mind that arrogance is a base thing and, as such, it is incompatible with the kind of person that we wish to be, e.g., someone possessing magnanimity and true nobility of character (13.30–8). Another one is to remind ourselves of the vicious reactions that our arrogance can trigger in other people, and in particular of envy and of malicious joy (12.12–36).¹⁸ Also, we may use a kind of plain speaking, towards ourselves.¹⁹ Finally, we should observe people's reactions to the arrogant man and the damage that the vice may cause him.²⁰

humblest condition” (15.36–40), presumably because he will now value himself little and will see himself as inferior to others.

¹⁷ For detailed discussion of these strategies, see Tsouna (2001).

¹⁸ The poor condition of the text leaves some doubt as to whether Philodemus truly recommends this therapeutic strategy.

¹⁹ “You should ask yourself many times over: ‘What is it that makes me haughty and arrogant? Is it that I have acquired more small coins? Or that [I am counted] among the nobility, namely those who serve as generals and who are honored every year by wearing a general's cloak?’ For you will find then each one of these things trivial and the boasting about them ill-bred” (15.12–22). And you should also try to see that arrogance, if taken to extremes, is nothing but stupidity and madness (16.15–27).

²⁰ “Having gathered together many people who observe him and are ready to trip him up, he finds himself slandered and then, since he does not want to get rid of his arrogance by means of words, he is relieved of it by means of his failures” (14.15–22).

II

The account of arrogance which has emerged so far has yielded a complex analysis of the vice in terms of disposition, attitudes, and behavior.²¹ At this point, more conceptual work is needed in order to identify and individuate the vice. Aristo's analysis of blends of arrogance serves precisely that purpose. It complements Philodemus' own contributions to the matter,²² by describing complex traits centered on arrogance, by specifying the place of arrogance in each of them, and by differentiating each vice from other character-features that belong, as it were, to the same family.

The traits in question seem to constitute a separate category of vices. All of them contain arrogance, albeit in different amounts and in varying forms. Each blend substantiates a recognisable human "type" or "character" which is denoted by a name capturing the essential features of the blend in question. Aristo's first task is to describe each of these complex traits and to explain how it differs from arrogance as well as from other blends.

Thus, the arrogant "character" must be distinguished from the inconsiderate one (αἰθάρης), who is "a blend of conceit, arrogance, and scorn, and also has a generous share of thoughtlessness" (16.29–33). In comparison to the inconsiderate person, "the self-willed man [αὐθέκαστος] is not so very [thoughtless] or irrational but rather self-opinionated, since he believes that he alone has any sense and is convinced that he will be successful in everything (if he relies on himself), whereas he will go wrong if he relies on the judgement of someone else; and he also has a share of arrogance" (17.17–25). "Even worse is the man-who-knows-all [παντειδύμων], since he has convinced himself

²¹ These elements are further illustrated by looking into the practical consequences of the vice. As a state of mind, arrogance is inherently painful and troubling. Instrumentally, it leads to the practical ruin of the agent.

²² Philodemus works in this direction with considerable thoroughness and resourcefulness. First, he distinguishes features belonging to arrogance proper from traits which might appear arrogant and which are found in the wise man. Then, he compares arrogance with magnanimity and explains why these two character features, although similar in certain respects, are classified the one as a vice and the other as a virtue. Next, he argues that arrogance is typically found together with the "cousin" vices of envy and malicious joy, thus raising questions about the nature of the mutual connections between vices in the soul. Finally, he cites Aristo's analysis of complex vices.

that he knows everything, some things because he has learned them from the greatest experts, others because he merely has observed the experts making them, others because he has invented them on his own” (18.12–18); “he is the kind of man who [disgraces] himself by laying claim to [all] disciplines; and he calls ignorant those who laugh at him” (18.35–8).

Yet a different blend is the man affecting dignity (σεμνοκόπος), who acts the part of the truly dignified person and who pretends to be such a person in his way of speaking as well as in the cast of his face and eyes, dress, movement and occupations (21.3–13). Another “type” is the man who bears himself and behaves in a haughty manner (βρενθυόμενος).

He looks down upon everybody, stares at them with disapproval, shakes his head, and belittles with ridicule and barely even a brief retort, which expresses his own superiority and is dismissive of everyone else, the people whom he encounters or those mentioned in his presence, even if they count among those considered important. [21.22–33]

The ironic character (εἴρων) is the kind of man who does not say what he means but rather the opposite.²³

[He has the habit of] praising the person whom he blames and, on the other hand, of humiliating and blaming himself and [those deserving praise on all occasions], reversing what he wants to say; the concept we have of him also includes a great capacity [to invent things] and the power of persuasion. [22.1–10]

Four further blends, the disparager (εὐτελιστής) and the utter disparager (ἐξευτελιστής), the vilifier (οὐδενωτής) and the utter vilifier (ἐξουδενωτής), “[are similar] and amount to the same thing, although they differ as to whether the slanderous distortion of one’s neighbour is relaxed or intense.²⁴ Thus, the utter disparager describes a person currently absent so as to make him seem relatively unimportant, whereas the utter vilifier makes him seem totally worthless” (24.1–10).

Aristo individuates further each blend by describing in detail the associated behavior as well as the practical consequences of having that

²³ On the Peripatetic as opposed to the Stoic analysis of the εἴρων, see Ioppolo (1996) and n. 1 above.

²⁴ I am grateful to Steve White for his comments on this point.

particular disposition.²⁵ For example, the inconsiderate man is depicted as the kind of man who, “when he buys a slave, he does not even ask for his [name] or give him a name himself, but calls him ‘slave’ and nothing else. The man who rubbed him with oil he does not rub with oil in return. And although he has been offered hospitality, he does not return it” (17.1–6).²⁶ As a consequence, he must confront the difficulties caused by his vice, “and in particular by his thoughtlessness as well as by the anger of those to whom he behaves in this manner” (19.7–9).²⁷

Compare and contrast those traits now with the portrait of the self-willed man:

the kind of man who, without asking anyone’s advice, goes on a trip, buys or sells, runs for office or carries out any other thing. If someone asks him what he intends to do, he answers, “I know what I am doing.” If someone blames him, he retorts, “You blame me?” If he is invited to a meeting to help a man who seeks advice, he does not want to say what he thinks unless that man is definitely going to do it ... And not only he is not ashamed when people call him self-willed, but he also claims that ... he is the only person able to survive if he were left on his own. [17.25–18.11]

As a result, “he fails in most things and becomes everybody’s target for malicious joy and nasty laughter, and he gets no help” (19.21–5); “he inevitably fares badly” (19.30) and is bound to regret many things and to reap lots of abuse (19.34–7).

We are now in a position to draw some inferences regarding the nature and the formal structure of Aristo’s blends of arrogance. Each of them has behavioral as well as dispositional aspects. Each one is a content-sensitive internal state, causally related to certain types of reactions to situations as these are perceived by the vicious agent. Each one is defined in terms of a focal vice, arrogance. And each one is further specified by reference to a cluster of other vicious characteristics,

²⁵ On the implications of ridicule associated with each blend, see Vogt in this volume.

²⁶ Furthermore, “when he knocks at another person’s door, if someone asks, ‘Who is it?’ he does not answer until that person comes outside. When a friend visits him while he is ill he does not say how he is feeling, nor when he himself visits someone does he ask such a question. And when he writes a letter, he does not add ‘greetings’ or ‘best wishes’ at the end” (17.7–17).

²⁷ “The fact that he faces people who are like him or who do not want to have any kind of dealings with him brings him into distress; and so does the fact that everybody runs away from him dismissing him for a madman” (19.9–17).

which are peripheral and perhaps secondary and subordinate to the primary vice.

III

Naturally, the account of thoughtlessness, self-willfulness, and other complex vices found in Aristo cannot be endorsed wholesale today. In the first place, it relies on methodological assumptions which we no longer make. In the second place, it contains elements that belong to the Greco-Roman social and cultural context but are alien to our own moral experience. However, the explanation of arrogance-related traits in terms of vicious blends incorporates beliefs and intuitions which we may choose to retain. More importantly, the assessment of these intuitions will help us finally to address the question in what ultimately consists the wrongness of arrogance.

One feature worth considering is the identification of arrogance as a focal vice. Although I am not sure about the extent to which Aristo's analysis might work, it seems to me initially attractive for several reasons. Psychologically, it suggests that several closely resembling character traits largely correspond to one disposition or, as the ancients might put it, one state of the soul, namely arrogance. Ethically, it makes it possible to determine the wrongness of a fairly broad range of attitudes, reactions, and behavioral patterns by referring primarily (although not solely) to a single bad character trait. Besides, from an explanatory point of view, Aristo's approach is economical, and also intuitive. We do tend to associate, e.g., deliberate rudeness, excessive self-confidence, the pretense of polymathy, affectations of nobility, irony, or systematic slander with overinflated egos. Hence, we do assume that arrogance should importantly figure in any account of such attitudes and behavior.

If we take arrogance to be central to the blends of vices belonging to the same family, two further intuitions underlying the above analysis seem to me defensible. First, Aristo's notion of blends points to the idea that arrogance is prior to the other traits constituting each blend, at least in the sense of being its most important constituent, and also in the sense of being a necessary condition making possible the development of peripheral vicious traits. This idea sounds largely correct, both pragmatically and conceptually. In truth, it is difficult even to think of a man who would be inconsiderate, self-willed, knowing-all, affecting dignity,

behaving haughtily, ironic, and disparaging or vilifying others, without also being arrogant. Furthermore, one's perception of oneself as a human being incomparably better than others appears to be precisely what enables one to treat other people thoughtlessly, to consider them ignorant and inept, and to offend them through haughtiness, irony, or slander.

Second, there is plausibility to the suggestion that the sense of superiority essential to arrogance varies in its scope, objects, and expressions, and that these variations are determined by the specific cluster of peripheral vices surrounding arrogance. While the inconsiderate person feels superior regarding who he is, the superiority of the self-willed man is focused on what he alone can *achieve* and that of the man-who-knows-all centers on what he *knows*. People affecting dignity, as well as those tainted by haughtiness, attach their sense of superiority to their *appearance* and to the impressions created by their bearing and demeanor. The superiority of the ironic man concerns his *wit*, and also his command of language and of bodily expressions for ironical purposes. As to the disparager and the vilifier, their arrogance is focused on the *objects* of their slander: they feel superior with regard to people whom they describe in their absence as "relatively unimportant" (24.7–8) or "totally worthless" (24.9–10).

A last feature that deserves attention is an idea which underlies Aristo's theory of blends,²⁸ namely, that they are interconnected in ways parallel to the ways in which the virtues entail each other. As is well known, ancient philosophers tend to believe in the unity of the virtues, i.e., the thesis that if an individual possesses one of the virtues, he must possess them all, as parts of a rational structure which determines our moral attitudes towards ourselves and the world. Aristo's approach reflects that thesis. But in addition, he suggests that certain clusters of vices, namely, the blends of arrogance outlined above, belong together (or even are mutually entailing) in virtue of a focal character trait.

The general picture that emerges is that arrogance is a major vice, both because it is itself a fundamental distortion of character and because it is typically accompanied by other such distortions. Therefore, any person who suffers from it has his character altered to such an extent that he cannot be truly good. Aristo's discussion of blends of arrogance drives home precisely this point. In concluding, then, I

²⁸ It also underlies Philodemus' approach to vices in general.

suggest that Philodemus' choice to end his treatise by citing Aristo is a particularly fortunate one. Philodemus does not make it merely on account of the protreptic character of Aristo's writing and of its persuasive force,²⁹ as has been usually thought. Rather, he makes it for philosophical reasons, which we ourselves would consider legitimate.³⁰

Works Cited

- Gigante, M. 1997. "Atakta," *Cronache Ercolanesi* 27: 153–4.
- Ioppolo, A. M. 1980. *Aristone di Chio e lo Stoicismo antico* (Naples: Bibliopolis).
- — —. 1996. "Il *Peri tou kouphizein hyperephanias*: una polemica antiscettica in Filodemo?," in *Atti del Convegno sull'epicureismo greco e romano*, ed. G. Giannantoni and M. Gigante (Naples: Bibliopolis), 715–34.
- Kleve, K. 1983. "Scurra Atticus: The Epicurean View of Socrates," in *Syzetesis: Studi sull'epicureismo greco e romano offerti a Marcello Gigante* (Naples: Bibliopolis), 227–53.
- Tiberius, V. and J. D. Walker. 1998. "Arrogance," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 35: 379–90.
- Tsouana, V. 2001. "Philodemus on the Therapy of Vice," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 21: 233–58.

²⁹ These features of Aristo's work are emphasised by Ioppolo (1996).

³⁰ I have used square brackets in my translations to indicate those places in which a given word or phrase has been heavily restored and I am not entirely confident that the supplementation is correct. I have not marked with square brackets supplementations that I consider correct. I should like to thank Elisabeth Asmis, John Fitzgerald, Matt Hanser, Kevin Falvey, and Richard McKirahan for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper. The paper was delivered at the conference on the Early Hellenistic Lyceum at the University of Texas at Austin and I am very grateful to the audience for their comments.

7

Aristo of Ceos in the Greek Gnomologies

Denis M. Searby

1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to deal with the sayings attributed to Aristo of Ceos in the Greek gnomological tradition.¹ I have two options. I could just state the fact and leave it at that; the fact is that there are no sayings explicitly attributed to Aristo of Ceos. The other option is to discuss the extant sayings that may belong to him. I have chosen the second option. I will thus be examining the few sayings that could belong to the Peripatetic philosopher Aristo of Ceos in the Greek gnomological tradition. As we shall see, these sayings may equally belong to the Stoic Aristo of Chios, since they are attributed simply to “Aristo the philosopher.”

¹ By “Greek gnomological tradition” I mean the maxims (*gnomai*), apophthegms, and anecdotes (*chreiai*) handed down either through individual authors such as Diogenes Laertius, Aelian, and Plutarch, or through collections of sayings (gnomologies) such as the so-called *Gnomologium Vaticanum* (the only one relevant in the present case), or through text anthologies such as Stobaeus, the *Loci Communes* of ps.-Maximus, etc. For a discussion of the terminology for sayings and collections, see Searby (1998) 13–22.

The sayings explicitly attributed to the Stoic Aristo by Diogenes Laertius will not be dealt with here.

Unfortunately, Diogenes Laertius has left us no Life of Aristo of Ceos; nor, for that matter, has anyone else, which means that we know little about him. The only information about Aristo found in Diogenes Laertius comes from a few passing references to him, sometimes as a source. However, the Life of Aristo of Chios contains a catalogue of works some of which were claimed for the Peripatetic Aristo by Panaetius and Sosicrates (cf. D.L. 7.168). One of the titles tells us that Aristo (whichever Aristo it was) compiled eleven books of *Chreiai* or anecdotes. Accordingly, although these would not be sayings attributed to Aristo, still Aristo may figure as a collector of sayings and thus a source for the later tradition. The early confusion between the two similarly named philosophers has left a trail of confusion down to our own days and still keeps classical scholars gainfully employed. This also proves true as regards the sayings.

2. Evidence for Aristo of Ceos as a Collector of Sayings

As far as I have seen, there are no maxims or anecdotes attributed to Aristo of Ceos himself in extant literary works. In the anthology attributed to Joannes Stobaeus, we do find the following entries associated in the lemmata with an unspecified Aristo:

2.1.24 'Αρίστωνος. 'Αρίστων ἔφη τῶν ζητουμένων παρὰ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις τὰ μὲν εἶναι πρὸς ἡμᾶς, τὰ δὲ μηδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, τὰ δ' ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς. πρὸς ἡμᾶς μὲν τὰ ἡθικά· μὴ πρὸς ἡμᾶς δὲ τὰ διαλεκτικά, μὴ γὰρ συμβάλλεσθαι πρὸς ἐπανάρθωσιν βίου· ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς δὲ τὰ φυσικά, ἀδύνατα γὰρ ἐγνώσθαι καὶ οὐδὲ παρέχειν χρεῖαν.

2.2.14 'Εκ τῶν 'Αρίστωνος 'Ομοιωμάτων. Οἱ ἐν διαλεκτικῇ βαθύνοντες εἰκόνασι καρκίνους μασωμένοις, οἳ δι' ὀλίγον τροφίμον περὶ πολλὰ ὅσῃ ἀσχολοῦνται.

2.2.18 'Αρίστωνος. 'Αρίστων ἔλεγεν εἰοικέναι τὴν διαλεκτικὴν τῷ ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς πηλῷ· πρὸς οὐδὲν γὰρ οὐδ' ἐκείνον χρήσιμον ὄντα καταβάλλειν τοὺς βαδίζοντας.

2.2.22 'Αρίστωνος. 'Αρίστων τοὺς λόγους τῶν διαλεκτικῶν εἴκαζεν τοῖς τῶν ἀραχνίων ὑφάσμασιν οὐδὲν μὲν χρησίμοις, λίαν δὲ τεχνικοῖς.

2.2.23 'Εκ τῶν 'Αρίστωνος 'Ομοιωμάτων. 'Ο ἑλλέβορος ὀλοσχερέστερος μὲν ληφθεὶς καθαίρει, εἰς δὲ πάνυ σμικρὰ τριφθεὶς πνίγει· οὕτω καὶ ἡ κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν λεπτολογία.

2.31.83 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὀμοιωμάτων. Τὸ κύμινον, φασί, δεῖ σπεῖρειν βλασφημοῦντας, οὕτω γὰρ καλὸν φύεσθαι· καὶ τοὺς νέους χρὴ παιδεύειν ἐπισκώπτοντας, οὕτω γὰρ χρήσιμοι ἔσονται.

2.31.95 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὀμοιωμάτων. Κυβερνήτης μὲν οὔτε ἐν μεγάλῳ πλοίῳ οὔτε ἐν μικρῷ ναυτιάσει, οἱ δὲ ἄπειροι ἐν ἄμφοιν· οὕτως ὁ μὲν πεπαιδευμένος καὶ ἐν πλούτῳ καὶ ἐν πενίᾳ οὐ ταράττεται, ὁ δ' ἀπαιδευτος ἐν ἄμφοιν.

3.4.109 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὀμοιωμάτων. Ἀρίστων ὁ Χίος τοὺς περὶ τὰ ἐγκύκλια μαθήματα πονουμένους, ἀμελοῦντας δὲ φιλοσοφίας, ἔλεγεν ὁμοίους εἶναι τοῖς μνηστῆρσι τῆς Πηνελόπης, οἱ ἀποτυγχάνοντες ἐκείνης περὶ τὰς θεραπαίνας ἐγίνοντο.

3.4.110 Ὁ αὐτὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς εἵκαζε τῷ Λαέρτῃ, ὅστις τῶν κατὰ τὸν ἀγρὸν ἐπιμελούμενος πάντων, ὀλιγώρως εἶχεν ἑαυτοῦ· καὶ γὰρ τοῦτους τῶν κτημάτων πλείστην ἐπιμέλειαν ποιουμένους περιορᾷ τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτῶν πλήρη παθῶν αγρίων οἶσαν.

3.13.40 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὀμοιωμάτων. Ὅμοιον ἀψινθίου τὸ δριμὺ καὶ λόγου παρρησίαν ἐκκόψαι.

3.13.57 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὀμοιωμάτων. Φῆσαντός τινος “λίαν μοι ἐπισκώπτεις,” ἔφη “καὶ γὰρ τοῖς σπληνικοῖς τὰ μὲν δριμέα καὶ πικρὰ ὠφέλιμα, τὰ δὲ γλυκέα βλαβερὰ.”

3.20.69 Ἀρίστωνος. Τὴν κακολογίαν ἡ ὀργὴ φαίνεται ἀπογεννώσα ὥστε † ἡ μήτηρ οὐκ ἀστεία.

4.22a.16 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος. Σπαρτιατῶν νόμος τάττει ζημίας, τὴν μὲν πρώτην ἀγαμίου, τὴν δευτέραν ὀψιγαμίου, τὴν τρίτην καὶ μεγίστην κακογαμίου.

4.25.44 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὀμοιωμάτων. οἱ ἄρτι ἐκ φιλοσοφίας παντας ἐλέγχοντες καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γονέων ἀρχόμενοι πάσχουσιν ὅπερ νεώητοί κύνες· οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἄλλους ὑλακτοῦσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἑνδον.

4.31d.110 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὀμοιωμάτων. Ὡς τὸν αὐτὸν οἶνον πίνοντες οἱ μὲν παροινοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ πραῦνονται, οὕτω καὶ πλουτοῦν. . . .

4.52a.18 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀρίστωνος Ὀμοιωμάτων. Πολλοὶ σοφοὶ γηραιοὶ φιλοζωοῦσι. καὶ γὰρ οἱ ὅψε γήμαντες φιλοζωοῦσιν, ἢ ἐκθρέψωσι τὰ τέκνα, καὶ οὗτοι ὅψε ἀρετῆς ἐπήβολοι γενόμενοι ἐφίενται αὐτὴν ἐκθρέψαι.

With one exception, all of these can be safely attributed to Aristo of Chios, especially given the explicit mention of him in the text of 3.4.109 and Diogenes Laertius attribution of 2.2.22 to him (D.L. 7.161). The first is a doxographical entry; all but one of the rest are similes or *homoeomata* taken from a collection compiled by Aristo, although one of these, 3.13.57, takes the form typical of a *chreia* rather than a *homoeoma*.² The exception is 4.22a.16 which has been admitted among

² On the form of the *chreia*, see Searby (1998) 15–17, where more references are given. The present instance may be said to contain a kind of comparison, the remedy of mocking the philosopher's student (it seems) being compared to the bitter nourish-

the fragments of Aristo of Chios (fr. 400 SVF 1), as well as among those of Aristo of Ceos (fr. 26 Wehrli = 45). Since it does not involve a saying, I will not enter into a discussion of it at present. The title *Homoeomata* does not occur in the catalogue of Diogenes Laertius in his Life of Aristo of Chios, and the anthology of Stobaeus remains the only place where such a title is associated with Aristo. Seeing the word *homoeomata*, one might be tempted to think of the work Ἐρωτικά ὅμοια (cf. 10–14, 22) ascribed to Aristo of Ceos by Athenaeus (13 564A = 13A), but one can see from the nature of the selections in Stobaeus and the quotations in Athenaeus that it is a question of two very different kinds of work.³ Despite the fact that Aristo of Chios is explicitly mentioned in one of these selections (3.4.109), the question has arisen whether or not the work should be ascribed to Aristo of Ceos, due to the content of a couple of the selections, but the only reasonable answer to this is a very firm “no.”⁴

There is another title mentioned in Stobaeus which might be argued to belong either to Aristo of Ceos or Aristo of Chios, depending on how we interpret the catalogue of works in Diogenes Laertius. I refer to the following selections going under the lemma Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν:

3.5.42 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν. Γέλων ὁ Σικελίας τύραννος σαπρόστομος ἦν. ὡς οὖν τῶν φίλων τις εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ὠργίζετο τῇ γυναικὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἐμήνυσεν αὐτῷ. ἥ δὲ ἔφη, “ᾧμην γὰρ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὁποίως ᾧζειν τὸ στόμα.”

ment useful for “splenetic” persons, but the selection still does not appear well suited for inclusion in a collection of *homoeomata*.

³ In Diogenes Laertius’ catalogue of works by Aristo of Chios, we find the title Ἐρωτικά διατριβαί, which Tsekourakis (1980) 238–57 would identify with the Ἐρωτικά ὅμοια. This latter title occurs only once in Athenaeus and it is next to impossible to determine what was intended by ὅμοια on the basis of the title alone. The fragments normally assigned to this work give the impression of being a historical or biographical work and certainly not a collection of similes.

⁴ The selections are Stob. 2.31.95 and 4.31d.110. The objection was to the supposed influence of Bion on their content. Cf. the discussion in Ioppolo (1980), especially 310–11. The question has also been raised whether or not the selections in Stobaeus said to come from the Τομάρια of Aristonymus, or at least some of them, really belong to Aristo of Chios, but this possibility, which I regard as extremely doubtful, falls outside the present discussion.

3.7.29 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν. Ἀνάξαρχος ὁ φυσικός, εἰπόντος αὐτῷ Ἀλεξάνδρου ὅτι κρεμῶ σε, “ἀπείλει τούτοις” ἔφη “τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἐμοὶ δὲ οὐδὲν διαφέρει ὑπὲρ γῆς ἢ κατὰ γῆς σήπεσθαι.”

3.7.30 Ἐν ταύτῳ. Γοργῷ ἢ Λακεδαιμονία Λεωνίδου γυνή, τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς ἐπὶ στρατεῖαν πορευομένου, τὴν ἀσπίδα ἐπιδιδούσα εἶπεν “ἦ ταύταν ἢ ἐπὶ τάυτας.”

3.29.70 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν. Λᾶσος ὁ Ἑρμιονεὺς ἐρωτηθεὶς τί εἴη σοφώτατον, “πεῖρα” ἔφη.

3.29.90 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν. Δημοσθένης ἐρωτηθεὶς “πῶς τῆς ῥητορικῆς περιεγένου;” “πλέον” ἔφη “ἔλαιον οἴνου δαπανήσας.”

4.1.144 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν. Δημοσθένης ὁ ῥήτωρ ἔφη πόλεως εἶναι ψυχὴν τοὺς νόμους· “ὥσπερ γὰρ σῶμα στερηθὲν ψυχῆς πίπτει, οὕτω καὶ πόλις μὴ ὄντων νόμων καταλύεται.”

4.15b.31 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν. Ζήνων ὁ Στωϊκὸς φιλόσοφος ὁρῶν τινα τῶν γνωρίμων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγροῦ περισπώμενον, εἶπεν “ἐὰν μὴ σὺ τοῦτον ἀπολέσης, οὗτός σε ἀπολέσει.”

4.31c.91 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν. Ἀνακρέων ὁ μελοποιὸς λαβὼν τάλαντον χρυσίου παρὰ Πολυκράτους τοῦ τυράννου, ἀπέδωκεν εἰπὼν “μισῶ δωρεὰν ἥτις ἀναγκάζει ἀγρυπνεῖν.”

4.50b.83 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν. Ἀλεξίς ὁ τῶν κωμωδιῶν ποιητής, ἐπειδὴ τις αὐτὸν ὄντα πρεσβύτην ἐώρα μόλις πορευόμενον καὶ ἡρώτα “τί ποιεῖς,” ἔφη “κατὰ σχολὴν ἀποθνήσκω.”

4.51.28 Ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους Χρειῶν. Γοργίας ὁ ῥήτωρ ἥδη γηραιὸς ὑπάρχων ἐρωτηθεὶς εἰ ἡδέως ἀποθνήσκει, “ἥδιστα” εἶπεν “ὥσπερ δὲ ἐκ σαπροῦ καὶ ῥέοντος συνοικιδίου ἀσμένως ἀπαλλάττομαι.”

In *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus*,⁵ Valentin Rose held that this title was a corruption of the *Chreiai* of Aristo mentioned by Diogenes Laertius, in which case there is a possibility of it belonging to the Peripatetic Aristo.⁶

Some of these selections contain anecdotes about people younger than or living after Aristotle. This would eliminate Aristotle himself as the original compiler, unless we postulate later accretions to a collection begun by Aristotle. In the short space of these ten excerpts, we meet an array of characters all belonging to the early third century or before,

⁵ Rose (1863) 611–13.

⁶ See also Searby (1998) 77–84, where the evidence is examined, and 145–57 for detailed commentary on these selections. Perhaps Hense’s explanation (cf. his note on Stob. 3.5.42), that the title was given to a collection of sayings of various philosophers starting with Aristotle, remains the best conjecture. In Searby (1998), I preferred explaining it simply as a collection attributed to Aristotle perhaps as early as the Hellenistic period, although not really compiled by him but still, perhaps, connected in some way to the Peripatetic tradition where we find other collections of *chreiai* such as that attributed to Demetrius of Phaleron.

and of a kind that would have appealed to Hellenistic tastes: self-sufficient philosophers, a tyrant and his wife, comic poets, famous orators, and even a Spartan woman. Interestingly, for the second and the tenth selections, there are parallels going back to the obscure Cynic philosopher named Teles who flourished around 235 BC. In both these cases, moreover, we find possible connections to Bion of Borysthene.⁷ This may have some significance in the present context, inasmuch as Strabo (*Geogr.* 10.5.6) tells us that Aristo of Ceos was an admirer of Bion.⁸

To summarize the evidence then: Diogenes Laertius mentions a collection of *chreiai* compiled by either Aristo of Ceos or Chios; we find ten selections from the *Chreiai* of Aristotle in Stobaeus that evidently could not have been compiled by Aristotle the Stagirite; a collection of *chreiai* was also attributed to the Peripatetic philosopher Demetrius of Phalerum (D.L. 5.81); the mistake of Aristo for the better known Aristotle would have been fairly easy to make; the content of the selections contradicts attributing the collection to Aristotle but fits well with Aristo. Now, the strongest argument against attributing these selections to Aristo is the manuscript evidence, since Aristo's name never turns up as a variant for Aristotle. Elsewhere we do have one likely confusion of the names of Aristo and Aristotle, which involves one of the similes that also appears among the *homoeomata* of Aristo.⁹ Otherwise I have

⁷ Cf. Stob. 3.7.29 with Teles (Hense [1909] 29–31, *Περὶ φυγῆς*): τί γὰρ τὸ διάφορον; ἢ οὐ πανταχόθεν, φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστιππος, ἴση καὶ ὁμοία ἢ εἰς ἄδου ὁδός; ἢ τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰ μὴ ταφήσῃ, τί σοι μέλει; ἀλλ' ἢ περὶ ταφῆς ἀγωνία, φησὶν ὁ Βίων, πολλὰς τραγωδίας ἐποίησεν . . . εἰ δὲ μὴ κρυφθεῖς, ἀλλὰ ἄταφος ριφθεῖς, τί τὸ δυσχερές; ἢ τί διαφέρει ὑπὸ πυρὸς κατακαυθῆναι ἢ ὑπὸ κυνὸς καταβρωθῆναι ἢ ἐπάνω τῆς γῆς ὄντα ὑπὸ κοράκων ἢ καταρυχθέντα ὑπὸ σκολῆκων; Cf. Stob. 4.51.28 with Teles (Hense [1909] 15–16, *Περὶ αὐταρκείας*): καθάπερ καὶ ἐξ οἰκίας, φησὶν ὁ Βίων, ἐξοικιζόμεθα, ὅταν τὸ ἐνοίκιον ὁ μισθώσας οὐ κομιζόμενος τὴν θύραν ἀφέλῃ, τὸν κέραμον ἀφέλῃ, τὸ φρέαρ ἐγκλείσῃ, οὕτω, φησί, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ σωματίου ἐξοικίζομαι, ὅταν ἡ μισθώσασα φύσις τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀφαιρῇται, τὰ ὄτα, τὰς χεῖρας, τοὺς πόδας· οὐχ ὑπομένω, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐκ συμποσίου ἀπαλλάττομαι οὐθὲν δυσχεραίνων, οὕτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ βίου, ὅταν [ἡ] ὥρα ᾗ, “ἔμβα πορθμίδος ἔρυμα.”

⁸ Kindstrand (1976) 82 thinks that Strabo's information is mistaken and that it was “Aristo of Chios, the Cynic Stoic . . . who tried to emulate Bion”; cf. also Ioppolo (1980) 51, and n. 4 above.

⁹ Elias, *In Porph. Isag.* (CAG 18.1) 21: φησὶ γὰρ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀποφθέγμασιν ὅτι “ὅσοι ταῖς ἄλλαις τέχναις καὶ ἐπιστήμαις σχολάζοντες τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀμελοῦσιν, εὐόικασιν τοῖς μνηστήρσι τῆς Πηνελόπης, οὔτινες αὐτῇ συγγενέσθαι μὴ δυνάμενοι ἡγάπων κἂν ταῖς θεραπαῖναις αὐτῆς συγγίνεσθαι.” Cf. Searby (1998) 76–7.

found no confusion of these two names in the gnomological tradition. If we really are dealing with a confusion of names in the case of the *Chreiai* of Aristotle, then it probably took place before the time of Stobaeus and was not due to a later corruption. In sum, the evidence for Aristo of Ceos as a compiler of sayings is tenuous indeed.

3. Evidence for Aristo's Own Sayings

I will now turn to the sayings attributed to Aristo himself rather than to a collection made by him.¹⁰ The only sayings I have come across are the following ones found in three manuscripts representing the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* tradition:

Cod. Vat. gr. 743; see Sternbach (1887):

GV 120 Ἀρίστων ὁ φιλόσοφος τοὺς πλουσίους καὶ φειδωλοὺς ὁμοίους ἔφησεν εἶναι τοῖς ἡμίμοις, οἵτινες χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον φέροντες χόρτον ἐσθίουσιν.

GV 121 Ὁ αὐτὸς πολυκέφαλον θηρίον εἶπεν πάντα δῆμον.

GV 122 Ὁ αὐτὸς τοὺς τὰ γραπτὰ λέγοντας ὁμοίους ἔφησεν εἶναι τοῖς λεοντοχάσμασι τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν κεράμων· ἐκεῖνα μὲν γάρ, ἕως μὲν ἂν βρέχη, ῥεῖ· ὅταν δὲ παύσῃται, κέχνηεν· οὗτοί τε, ἕως ἂν ἔχῃσι γραπτὰ λέγειν, εὐρώως φέρονται· ὅταν δὲ ἐπιλείπῃ, χᾶσκουσιν.

GV 123 Ὁ αὐτὸς παρεκελεύετο τοὺς τῶν ὑγιαίνοντων πόνους ἀναδέχεσθαι, ἵνα μὴ τοὺς τῶν νοσοῦντων ὑπομένωμεν.

Cod. Vat. gr. 1144; see Sternbach (1894):

AV1.22 = GV 120: ἔφησεν : ἔφη, οἵτινες . . . ἐσθίουσιν : οἵτινες τίμια βαστάζοντες ἅτιμα ἐσθίουσιν

¹⁰ Apart from the three cited versions of the GV-collection, I have made a search for sayings of Aristo in the following sources: *Corpus Parisinum* (codd. Par. gr. 1168 and Oxon. Digby 6), in Searby [forthcoming]); *Florilegium Atheniense* (cod. Athen. B.N. 1070 ff. 84^v – 158^v); *Florilegia duo graeca*, in Schenkl (1888); Diogenes Laertius (ed. Long); *Gnomica Basileensia*, in Kindstrand (1991); *Γνωμικά ὁμοιώματα des Socrates Plutarch Demophilus Demonax Aristonymus u.a. (Natalia Regis Augustissimi Guilelmi II Imperatoris Germanorum ab Universitate Fridericia Guilelmina Rhenana . . . celebranda)* 1–5, in Elter (1900–4); Ioannes Georgides, *Il prato e l'ape: Il sapere sentenzioso del monaco Giovanni*, in Odorico (1986); *Un traité de vie spirituelle et moral du XIe siècle: le florilège sacro-profane du manuscrit 6 de Patmos*, in Sargologos (1990); Maximus Confessor, *Loci communes* (ed. Combefis, in *Patrologia Graeca* 91); *Loci Communes of Maximus the Confessor: Vaticanus Graecus 739*, in Phillips (1977); *Ps.-Maximus Confessor. Erste kritische Edition einer Redaktion des sacro-profanen Florilegiums Loci communes*, in Ihm (2001); Stobaeus, *Anthologium* (ed. Wachsmuth, Hense).

AV1.23 = GV 122: 'Ο αὐτὸς τοὺς τὰ γραπτὰ λέγοντας ὁμοίους ἔφησεν εἶναι τοῖς λεοντοχάσμοις· ἐκεῖνα μὲν γάρ, ἕως ἂν βρέχη, ῥεῖ.

AV1.24 = GV 126 (post Αἴσωπος): 'Ο αὐτὸς ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος τί τῶν ζώων ἐστὶ σοφώτατον εἶπεν “τῶν μὲν χρησίμων μέλισσα, τῶν δὲ ἀχρήστων ἀράχνης.”

Cod. Neapol. gr. II D 22; see Sbordone (1935-7):

Sbordone 6 = GV 120: ἔφη, οἵτινες . . . ἐσθίουσιν : οἵτινες τίμια βαστάζοντες ἄτιμα ἐσθίουσιν

Sbordone 7 = GV 122: 'Αρίστων ὁ φιλόσοφος τοὺς τὰ γραπτὰ λέγοντας ὁμοίους ἔφησεν εἶναι τοῖς λεοντοχάσμοις· ἐκεῖνα μὲν γάρ, ἕως ἂν βρέχη, ῥεῖ.

Sbordone 8: οἱ μέθη καὶ ἀδηφαγία δεδουλωμένοι οὔτε ὕπνον αἰροῦνται γνήσιον καὶ εἰλικρινῇ, οὔτε ὄνειράτων ἀπαλλάττονται φοβερῶν.

There is, in addition, a saying attributed to Zeno in which an unspecified Aristo asks a question, but this is certainly meant to be the Stoic Aristo (GV 301 'Ο αὐτὸς 'Αρίστωνος αὐτὸν ἐρομένου τί ποιῶν ἐγένετο σοφός, εἶπε “τοῖς κρείττοσιν ὑποτασσόμενος, τοῖς δὲ πᾶσιν ἴσοις συζητῶν, τοῖς δ' ἥττοσιν εἰσηγούμενος”).

AV1.24 can be quickly eliminated as really intended for Aesop. This collection is shorter than GV and makes several omissions of this kind, leading to confusion over to whom the often recurring phrase 'Ο αὐτὸς is meant to refer. The last saying in the Neapolitan MS, which Sbordone takes as an implicit attribution to Aristo, really comes from a collection of quotations spuriously attributed to St. John Chrysostom and can also be eliminated.¹¹ Note the lack of any kind of introductory formula in this saying, which is a clear indication in this context of an interpolation from another source. Thus we have four sayings attributed to an Aristo, two of which are attested in three manuscripts of the same tradition, one of them in two of the same manuscripts, and another attested only in one manuscript. According to my preliminary investigation, none of the four sayings appear anywhere else in the gnomological tradition; nor have I located any exact parallels elsewhere; therefore, there are no alternative attributions to consider.

In his note on our first saying in GV, Sternbach remarks that this and the subsequent sayings derive with little doubt (*procul dubio*) from the lost *Homoeomata* of Aristo of Chios. I take his assumption to be based

¹¹ Jo. Chrys., *Eclogae i–xlvi ex divers. hom.* (PG 63) 649: Οἱ γὰρ μέθη καὶ ἀδηφαγία δεδουλωμένοι, οὔτε ὕπνον αἰροῦνται γνήσιον καὶ εἰλικρινῇ, οὔτε ὄνειράτων ἀπαλλάττονται φοβερῶν.

on the fact that three of the four sayings can be classified as similes. However, it should be noted that only one of the selections from the *Homoeomata* reappears in the GV tradition. This is Stobaeus 3.4.109, a saying also attributed to Aristippus and Aristotle, that is, two philosophers whose names begin with the same five letters, as well as to Bion and Gorgias (GV attributes it to Gorgias). This saying was, accordingly, popular enough to have been included by the compiler of GV using a source other than Aristo's *Homoeomata*. It is possible that the Aristo sayings in GV did stem from the *Homoeomata* of Aristo, although that may be too neat an explanation, especially considering that the one verifiable parallel to one of Aristo's *homoeomata* in GV is specifically attributed to Gorgias and is, moreover, also found among the excerpts from the so-called *Chreiai* of Aristotle discussed above.

4. Brief Commentary on the Sayings

We may now take a very brief look at these five sayings one by one.

GV 120 = **41**: *Aristo the philosopher said that people who are rich but stingy are like mules that carry gold and silver but eat grass.*

This saying comes in two slightly different versions in our sources. In another context,¹² I have pointed out that AV1 and the Neapolitan manuscript show close affinities, and not only in the parts stemming from the GV-tradition. This can also be seen in the case of GV 122, where we again find these two manuscripts agreeing together against the text in GV. In the present case, however, the differences between the two have no effect on the content of the saying.

We have here a straightforward and not very successful simile on a common enough theme. "About Stinginess" (περὶ φειδωλίας) is the title of a chapter in Stobaeus (3.16). In the *Characters* of Theophrastus (*Char.* 10), the same theme is dealt with under the name of μικρολογία (it might also be pointed out here that Aristo continued the tradition of character sketches; see **20, 21, 26**). The sentiment here is the same as in the quotation ascribed to Menander (Stob. 3.16.7), "I have never admired the very wealthy man who doesn't enjoy anything of what he

¹² See Searby (1998) 51.

has” (Οὐ πόποτ’ ἐζήλωσα πλουτοῦντα σφόδρα ἄνθρωπον, ἀπολαύοντα μηδὲν ὧν ἔχει.)

GV 121 = 42: *The same man said that every democracy is a many-headed beast.*

The “many-headed beast” or, alternatively, the “hydra” occurs a number of times in metaphoric use in Greek prose. Although I have not found an exact parallel to this saying in the gnomological tradition, the thought must have been common. In *Republic* 9 (588C ff.), Plato speaks of the passionate part of the soul as a many-headed beast, while in *Laws* 3 (689B), this part of the soul is explicitly said to correspond to the role of the general population in the State. In his commentary on *Alcibiades I* (160.3 Creuzer), Proclus makes a direct connection between these two thoughts by comparing the many-headed beast in the soul directly to the δῆμος. The same comparison is made by Michael of Ephesus in his commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* (CAG 20.483), and he refers to Plato.

GV 122 = 43: *The same man said that those who deliver written speeches are like the lion-shaped spouts on tiled roofs, for, when it rains, they flow, but when it stops, they are empty. These people, when they have something written to speak, carry the crowd away flowingly, but when it runs out, they gape empty.*

This vivid metaphor is found in both a short and a long version in the manuscripts. Sternbach favours the shorter version and, accordingly, brackets the words in GV that are missing in AV1. He was not aware of the Neapolitan manuscript at the time. I am not sure I agree with him and have therefore left the words unbracketed, although, certainly, the shorter version is the better one from the stylistic point of view. The extra words in GV look like an explanation added later in the tradition. The unusual word λεοντόχασμα seems only to be found in two other places in the TLG database; LSJ explain it as an alternative to λεοντόκρουνον meaning “lion’s-head spout.” The image is that of the gutter of a building adorned at the end by a lion’s head in stone that spouts water when it rains. The sentiment expressed here is similar to the thought of another saying in GV: “Oenopides, seeing a boy with a lot of books, said: ‘Not on your bookshelf, but in your heart.’” (GV 420

Οἰνοπίδης ὁρῶν μειράκιον πολλὰ βιβλία κτώμενον ἔφη· “μὴ τῇ κιβωτῷ, ἀλλὰ τῷ στήθει”). This saying is also perhaps connected with the capacity for delivering a speech on the spur of the moment.

GV 123 = **44**: *The same man used to recommend submitting to the labors of the healthy so that we would not have to bear those of the sick.*

This saying, which occurs only in GV, is a simple reflection of the ideal of φιλοπονία, which is often encountered in the gnomological tradition as well as in ancient moralizing literature in general from Hellenistic times on.¹³

5. Conclusion

Given the scant information we have about the two Aristos and the generic content of these sayings, it is very difficult to say whether or not the sayings are aptly attributed to either of the two philosophers, or to one of them more than the other. It is also very difficult to determine from the evidence before us which of the two was intended as their author. We might note that there are a few sayings included in the narrative in Diogenes Laertius' biographical sketch of the Stoic Aristo; these have nothing in common with the sayings in the GV-tradition, although they are not of a kind likely to have been included in a collection like GV, tied as they are to specific circumstances or character traits. The point is that, although the Aristo sayings in GV are absent in Diogenes' account of Aristo of Chios, this need not imply that the GV sayings would be more appropriately attributed to the Peripatetic Aristo: there could have been sayings of Aristo of Chios in circulation that Diogenes missed; it is impossible to say much with any confidence on the subject. Both Peripatetics and Stoics are represented in the sayings of the GV-tradition, although the Peripatetics are admittedly better represented. We find Aristotle, Theophrastus, Demetrius, and Lyco with about 40 sayings in total, whereas the Stoics appear only in the persons of Zeno and Cleanthes with a total of only 10 sayings, discounting our four sayings above. On the whole, if I were forced to choose between Aristo of Chios and Aristo of Ceos as the more likely source of these sayings, I would probably choose the Chian, due to the mere

¹³ See Searby (1998) 266–7.

existence of the *Homoeomata* attributed to him. However, it seems to me best to accept the fact that we do not know enough here to make a secure choice.

Works Cited

- Elter, A. 1900-4. "Γνωμικὰ ὁμοιώματα des Socrates, Plutarch, Demophilus, Demonax, Aristonymus, u.a.," *Natalia Regis Augustissimi Guilelmi II Imperatoris Germanorum ab Universitate Fridericia Guilelmina Rhenana . . . celebranda*, 1-5 (Bonn Progr.).
- Ihm, S. 2001. *Ps.-Maximus Confessor: Erste kritische Edition einer Redaktion des sacro-profanen Florilegiums Loci communes* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner).
- Ioppolo, A. M. 1980. *Aristone di Chio e lo stoicismo antico* (Naples: Bibliopolis).
- Kindstrand, J. F. 1976. *Bion of Borysthenes. A Collection of the Fragments with Introduction and Commentary* (Uppsala: Uppsala University).
- . 1991. *Gnomica Basileensia* (Uppsala: Uppsala University).
- Odorico, P. 1986. *Ioannes Georgides. Il prato e l'ape: Il sapere sentenzioso del monaco Giovanni = Wiener Byzantinische Studien* 17 (Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie).
- Phillips, M. B. 1977. *Loci Communes of Maximus the Confessor: Vaticanus Graecus 739* (Dissertation, Saint Louis University).
- Rose, V. 1863. *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Sargologos, E. 1990. *Un traité de vie spirituelle et moral du XIe siècle: le florilège sacro-profane du manuscrit 6 de Patmos* (Thessalonica: Asprovalta).
- Sbordone, F. 1935-7. "Sentenze di filosofi e detti celebri d'antichi Spartani (Cod. Neapol. gr. II D 22)," *Filologia e Antichità Classiche, Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica* 19-20: 113-30; reprinted in Id., *Scritti di varia filologia* (Naples 1971), 164-81.
- Schenkl, H. 1888. *Florilegia duo graeca, Jahres-Bericht über das K.K. Akademische Gymnasium in Wien* (Vienna), 1-18.
- Searby, D. M. 1998. *Aristotle in the Greek Gnomological Tradition* (Uppsala: Uppsala University).

- — —. Forthcoming. *Corpus Parisinum* (codd. Par. gr. 1168 and Oxon. Digby 6).
- Sternbach, L. 1887. *Gnomologium Vaticanum e codice Vaticano graeco 743*, in *Wiener Studien* 9: 175–206; reprinted (Berlin 1963).
- — —. 1894. *Appendix Vaticana I* (e cod. Vat. gr. 1144), in *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejetnosci Wydzial Filologiczny* (Crakow) 20 = n.s. 5: 202–18.
- Tsekourakis, D. 1980. “Zwei Probleme der Aristonfrage,” *Rheinische Museum* 123: 238–57.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

8

Natural Philosophy in the Peripatos after Strato

Robert W. Sharples

One of the striking features in the history of the Peripatetic school is the decline in interest in natural philosophy after Theophrastus and Strato. That decline may not in itself be as puzzling as it seems at first sight; as John Glucker has argued, Aristotle's school was the odd one out among Athenian philosophical schools in the early Hellenistic period, in concerning itself with natural philosophy as a subject of interest in its own right. For the Epicureans physics was explicitly a means to an ethical end;² for the Stoics the claim that nothing happens without a cause (*SVF* 2.973) was not so much a principle of scientific enquiry as a theological statement. When it lost its interest in natural philosophy and reverted to a more standard philosophical type, Aristotle's school lost much of its distinctive *raison d'être*.³

¹ This paper was presented to the UCL Greek and Latin Departmental seminar in December 2000 and to the Project Theophrastus conference at Austin in March 2001. I am grateful for improvements to those who made comments then, and especially to Sylvia Berryman, Hans Gottschalk, Alan Griffiths, David Hahm, Jørgen Mejer, Alexander Mourelatos, Peter Pickering, Richard Sorabji, Peter Stork and Francesca Zardini; also to Stephen White for drawing my attention to various passages of Hieronymus, and for other suggestions.

² Epicurus, *Letter to Pythocles* 85; *Principal Doctrines* 11; fr. 221 Usener.

³ Glucker (1998) 313–14. Cf. also Long (1998) 365–7.

There is some evidence for a tenuous continuing interest. It is from the period after Strato that the pseudo-Aristotle *On Breath* comes, though it can hardly be counted as a distinguished contribution to the subject.⁴ Whether any of the material in the pseudo-Aristotle *Problems* is later than Strato is hard to tell.⁵ And for some of the individual Peripatetics of the period there is apparent, though scanty, evidence for some peripheral interest in nature. It is the purpose of this paper to examine this evidence in the cases of Lyco (head of the school from 270–68 to 226–4 BCE), Hieronymus of Rhodes (active in the middle of the third century BCE), and of Aristo of Ceos (active in second half of the third century BCE). The conclusion will be that the passages in question do not in fact indicate a primary concern with natural philosophy (which I am here defining narrowly so that it excludes epistemology).⁶ What they suggest is rather that for these authors as for writers later in antiquity — and for some periods of English literature too — there was not a sharp divide between what was appropriate to the “sciences” and what was relevant to the humanities.⁷

1. Lyco

The evidence for any concern with nature is most tenuous in the case of Lyco. First, Apuleius, *Apology* 36 refers to Lyco’s writing on animals (fr.15 SFOD = 30 Wehrli).⁸ Capelle argued that this was simply a mistake for Strato.⁹ Stephen White has suggested that we should perhaps think rather of Lycus of Rhegium, the writer on Sicily and Libya (c. 300

⁴ Cf. Annas (1992) 27–8.

⁵ Flashar (1962) 326, 333, 356–8 dates the pseudo-Aristotle *Problems* generally to the mid-third century BCE.

⁶ See below on Hieronymus frs. 10 and 40 White. Texts such as [Aristotle], *On Breath* and *On Colors* demonstrate an interest in epistemological, and more broadly psychological, topics.

⁷ Cf. Sharples (2000) 13–14, and references there.

⁸ Apuleius also refers to Eudemus, from whom a number of zoological observations are recorded by Aelian (Eudemus frs. 125–32 Wehrli). Their authenticity, at least in their present form, was questioned by Zeller (1879) 870 n. 1 and by Wehrli (1969a) ad loc.; it is defended, and their significance for Eudemus’ philosophical views discussed, by Sorabji (1993) 46 and by White (2002a).

⁹ Capelle (1927) 2306. For Strato’s zoological works, cf. Oliver Hellmann’s paper in this volume.

BCE), whose observations on zoological topics and on waters are reported by Antigonus.¹⁰

Wehrli however defended the reference to Lyco by appealing for his interest in natural science to another fragment (fr. 13 SFOD = 28 Wehrli) which contains two references to the grammatical form of the word for “salt.” Wehrli argued that the mention of salt on more than one occasion showed that Lyco was interested in salt in itself and not just as a comparison for some other topic.¹¹ As Oliver Hellmann points out,¹² this argument is inconclusive; Herodianus does not even state that both references come from the same work. And in any case, even if Lyco was interested in salt for its own sake, whether this was from the point of view of natural science is itself debatable. The first reference refers to the odor of salt; Lyco was, after all, notorious for his banquets. Can we be sure that the reference to the odor of salt did not occur in some culinary context? The reference to the odor of salt that is *dug up* need not imply a predominantly physical concern. And that there was a famous natural saltpit in the Troad, from where Lyco came,¹³ is again tenuous evidence on which to base an argument for his interest in natural science.¹⁴

2. Hieronymus

Hieronymus, as reported by Plutarch (*Quaest. conv.* 1.8 626AB = Hieronymus fr.10 White = 53 Wehrli), explained long-sightedness in the elderly by recourse to an effluence theory of sight; the denser particles travel less far than the finer ones, and vision in the elderly is more susceptible to disturbance by the denser particles.¹⁵ Wehrli in his

¹⁰ Respectively Antigonus, *Hist. mir. coll.* 60b, 172, 133, 139, 154. White (2002a) 209 n.6.

¹¹ Wehrli (1968) 26.

¹² Hellmann in this volume, n. 16.

¹³ Stephanus of Byzantium, *Ethnica* s.v. Τρωγασαί (630.1–4 Meineke); cf. Ruge (1937) 1893. I am grateful to Peter Stork for the points in this and the preceding sentence.

¹⁴ The neuter form τὸ ἄλας here attributed to Lyco and regarded as worthy of comment also occurs in [Aristotle], *Mirabilia* 138, on a salt spring in Illyria, a text which Flashar (1972) 140 regards as probably deriving from Theopompus.

¹⁵ I am grateful to Stephen White for drawing my attention to this passage and suggesting that I might discuss it here.

comment on this passage¹⁶ compares [Aristotle] *Problems* 31.25 959b37. Although this passage is indeed evidence for Peripatetic interest in the topic of far-sightedness,¹⁷ it solves the problem rather by appeal to the notion that the vision of each eye meets at a point some distance away from us. This is actually the *preceding* explanation in Plutarch, stated there in terms of the notion of cones of visual rays which is also found in [Aristotle] *Problems* 3.9 and 15.6. What is, however, striking is that Hieronymus (unless this point is Plutarch's own) illustrates his argument by an analogy with flowers smelling sweeter at a greater distance, arguing that this too is because the more earthy particles do not travel so far. This point is found in relation to odors both in Theophrastus, *CP* 6.17.1,¹⁸ and in [Aristotle], *Problems* 12.2, 12.4, and 12.9.¹⁹ Hieronymus is thus drawing on a general discussion in the Peripatos, but one which relates to psychology as well as to natural science in the narrow sense; Däbritz indeed suggested our fragment comes from Hieronymus' work *On Suspension of Judgement*.²⁰

Hieronymus' *Epistles* are cited by Athenaeus (10.45 434F–435A) as the source for Theophrastus' stating that Alexander the Great was not in good condition for love-making (Hieronymus fr. 30 White = 38 Wehrli; Theophrastus fr. 578 FHS&G).²¹ The context in Athenaeus is concerned with the effects of heavy drinking. Athenaeus attributes the connection between drinking and impotence in general to Aristotle in the *Problems*; but he presents its application specifically to Alexander the Great as his own suggestion, and cites Hieronymus and Theophrastus only for the fact of Alexander's impotence, not for its cause. It may be the case that one or both of them did indeed draw that connection; but the passage falls short of being explicit evidence for an

¹⁶ Wehrli (1969b) 44.

¹⁷ As is also [Alexander] *Problems* 1.74, where the explanation is in terms of the consistency of the visual $\pi\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$.

¹⁸ Cf. Sharples (1985) 193ff.

¹⁹ I am grateful to Stephen White for drawing my attention to these texts. Cf. also [Alexander], *Problems* 4.103 Usener = [Aristotle], *Problemata inedita* 2.102 Bussemaker. Theophrastus himself, to judge from *On Dizziness* 7–8, explained *vision* rather in terms of a visual ray proceeding from the eye to the object, a notion for which there is some evidence in Aristotle himself even though it is hard to reconcile with the official theory of *De anima*; cf. Sharples (2002) 217–20 and the references there.

²⁰ Däbritz (1913) 1562. Cf. Hieronymus fr. 8A no. 1a White.

²¹ For referring the title *Epistles* here to Hieronymus rather than to Theophrastus, cf. Fortenbaugh (1984) 333.

interest in the physical cause of Alexander's condition. As Fortenbaugh notes, Plutarch twice cites Theophrastus' remarks about fragrance and heat at *CP* 6.14.8 in order to apply them to Alexander's great bodily heat and consequent need for drink; but Theophrastus himself does not here mention Alexander.²² It is indeed characteristic of ancient writers to take more from their sources than they explicitly indicate; but even if Hieronymus did connect Alexander's condition with his drinking, this will only be evidence for his awareness of topics discussed as physical problems in the Peripatetic school, not for his having a primary interest in physical explanations himself.

Plutarch, *That a pleasant life cannot be achieved by following Epicurus* 1096A–B, cites Aristotle, Theophrastus (fr. 715 FHS&G), Dicaearchus (fr. 96 Mirhady = 74 Wehrli) and Hieronymus (fr. 40 White = 26 Wehrli) for a range of problems concerning “choruses and productions and pipes and rhythms and harmonies.”²³ [Aristotle] *Problems* 11.25 does indeed discuss one of the specific problems mentioned by Plutarch, that of why the sound of the chorus' singing is reduced if the dancing-floor is covered with straw. But whether Hieronymus' own interest in such matters was in the mechanics of hearing or rather (like Dicaearchus') in the history of the theatre is at best uncertain.

Finally, in Hieronymus fr. 45 White = 29 Wehrli, the term ἀλκαία for the lion's tail is explained by its lashing itself into a fury with it and thus achieving ἀλκή, strength. Andrea Martano (2004) 461 n. 18 has shown that the reference to ἀλκαία does not itself derive from Hieronymus. My colleague Alan Griffiths points out that ἀλκαία is actually not a genuine Greek word at all; it first occurs in Callimachus, applied to mice,²⁴ and was a learned joke, not so much explained by the connection with ἀλκή, as invented on the basis of it. It belongs, in other words, not in zoology but in literature. As for the part of the report which does apparently derive from Hieronymus, the lion's lashing itself with its tail, a parallel in Aelian, *NA* 6.1 (= Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *Excerpts* from Aristophanes of Byzantium's *Summary of Aristotle on Living Creatures* 2.157) may suggest that the topic was one mentioned in

²² Plutarch, *Alexander* 4.4–6, *Quaest. conv.* 1.6.1 623F; Theophrastus 417 no. 22 FHS&G. Fortenbaugh (1984) 333.

²³ I am again grateful to Stephen White for drawing Hieronymus frs. 40 and 45 White (below) to my attention.

²⁴ Callimachus fr. 177.23 Pfeiffer = fr. 259.23 in Lloyd-Jones and Parsons (1983).

early Peripatetic writings, and that Aelian and Hieronymus have a common Peripatetic source; but even if this is so, it is not evidence for Hieronymus' own interest in the topic being from the point of view of natural philosophy, and it may be doubted whether the alleged fact is one that would have appeared in a serious collection of zoological material at all.²⁵

3. Aristo

Aristo, here unequivocally identified as the Peripatetic, is cited by the Florentine paradoxographer, once conjecturally identified with Sotion, for the effects on the mind of water from a fountain in his home island of Ceos (Par. Flor. 25 = Aristo **17A**). This has been taken as evidence for his following in the tradition of Theophrastus' work *On Waters*, which is known to us mainly from reports about the remarkable effects of various springs and rivers, but which also contained theories concerning the reasons for these.²⁶ There is a parallel to the report by the Florentine paradoxographer, but without Aristo actually being named, in Vitruvius, *On Architecture* 8.3.22 (Aristo **17B**).²⁷ At 8.3.27 (= Theophrastus fr. 210 FHS&G) Vitruvius lists the sources he used for information on waters, and includes among them an otherwise unknown Aristides. Thiel,²⁸ followed by Steinmetz,²⁹ suggested that "Aristo" should be read in place of "Aristides"; this was doubted by Öhler,³⁰ and is rejected by Callebat³¹ on the grounds that the parallel between the reports in Vitruvius and in the Florentine paradoxographer is not a sufficient reason to change the MSS reading in Vitruvius 8.3.27.

Both in Vitruvius and in the Florentine paradoxographer the report on the fountain in Ceos is the middle one of a sequence of three reports of springs with remarkable effects, distinguished in both works from those that precede and follow them by the fact that each includes an

²⁵ I am grateful to Hans Gottschalk for this point.

²⁶ Theophrastus frs. 210–21 FHS&G; cf. Steinmetz (1964) 217–98 and Sharples (1998) 190–220, especially 192 and n. 556–8.

²⁷ *Anth. Gr.* Appendix 4.20, 3.94, 3.101 Cougny; 143a–c in Page (1982).

²⁸ Thiel (1897) 102.

²⁹ Steinmetz (1964) 222.

³⁰ Öhler (1913) 94.

³¹ Callebat (1973) 131.

epigram on the spring concerned.³² The first spring, at Clitor in Arcadia, makes those who wash in it averse to drinking wine; the second spring, at Ceos, makes those who drink from it “insensitive”³³ with a mind “like a rock”; the third, at Susa, causes one’s teeth to fall out. The supposition thus naturally suggests itself that not only the middle report in each case but the whole set of three derives, directly or indirectly, from Aristo; and this is indeed what Steinmetz (1964) 358 argues. On the other hand, it may in that case seem odd that Aristo is mentioned only in connection with the middle report of the three, even if this is the one that relates to his home town, and that no sources are given for the others.³⁴

There are several distinct issues here: problems internal to the reports in Vitruvius and the Florentine paradoxographer; the route by which this material, whatever its ultimate origin, reached these two authors; the origin of the epigrams; and the role of Aristo himself in the transmission. Even if Aristo is not the source for all three reports, however, the principles adopted in the collection of evidence for Theophrastus in FHS&G justify the inclusion of the whole of both Vitruvius’ and the Florentine paradoxographer’s reports in an edition of Aristo’s fragments. For the whole of each passage is relevant to the discussion concerning how much of it actually derives from Aristo.

At this point it is necessary to raise the question of the date of the Florentine paradoxographer. Musso (1977) 15–17, followed by Dorandi (1999) xvi and n. 2, argues not only that the concept of paradoxographical literature as a genre is post-classical, but also that all the apparent examples of the genre are Byzantine compilations. Musso

³² These epigrams are as far as I am aware transmitted only in these two ancient sources. The *Appendix* to the Greek Anthology in Cougny (1890) is a modern supplement, to be distinguished from the *Appendix Planudea*.

³³ I am grateful to Alexander Mourelatos for suggesting that the reference is to insensitivity rather than to foolishness, and for pointing out that this is an adaptation of the proverbial “like a stone,” for which LSJ s.v. λίθος cite Aristoph. *Clouds* 1202, where the reference is to the foolish (ἄβέλτεροι) creditors whom Strepsiades thinks are at the mercy of his son’s sophistry, and Plato (?), *Hippias Major* 292D, where the reference is to someone incapable of following an argument, “a millstone having neither ears nor brain.” Pliny in Aristo **17D** speaks of senses that become “duller” (*hebetes*) by contrast with those made keener (*subtiliores sensus*) by the stream in Cilicia. I am grateful also to Peter Stork for discussion of the translation.

³⁴ It is indeed *possible* that Aristo reported all three springs and their epigrams, and just mentioned in passing that he had actually seen the second one, and that a subsequent source chose to record this by attributing only the second report to Aristo.

(1976), however, argues this only for three works, all contained in the same MS: one ascribed to Antigonius of Carystus, which he argues is a compilation “by” Constantine Porphyrogenitus (or rather at his instigation) incorporating some genuine material from Antigonius;³⁵ one ascribed to Apollonius; and one ascribed to Phlegon of Tralles. Wenskus (2000) 311 says only that the *Paradoxographi* Florentinus, Vaticanus, and Palatinus cannot be dated, and that a Byzantine origin for them cannot be excluded. However, even if these texts are Byzantine in date in their present form — and even if they have no earlier independent existence of their own at all, if in other words they are composed of extracts taken in the Byzantine period directly from a range of independent earlier authors — the reconstructions of the tradition developed above all by Öhler, and discussed in what follows, are not necessarily affected, since the three *Paradoxographi* in every case appear at the end of branches of the tradition. What would be problematic would be the claim that a late date for these *Paradoxographi* automatically throws doubt on the attribution to Aristo; but it is not clear that that need be the case.

There are a number of oddities about the two reports containing the poems. First, there are variations between them in the text of the epigrams themselves.³⁶ The text as reported in Vitruvius is in a bad condition because of its transmission by scribes who did not know Greek; but even so, the variations are such that they have prompted the view

³⁵ Musso (1976) 3, endorsed by Dorandi (1999) xiv–xvi. The comparison naturally suggests itself (Musso 7) of Constantine’s *Excerpts* drawing on Aristophanes of Byzantium’s *Summary* of Aristotle’s zoological writings, on Aelian, and on other sources; similarly too the *Geoponica* based on the work of Cassianus Bassus (cf. Musso 8).

³⁶ In line 5 of the first poem, and in the second, the *Paradoxographus* Florentinus clearly offers a better reading; in the first line of the third, Page (1982) 454 regards either version as possible, though noting that κρανάεις is a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον. Line 9 of the first poem is problematic: Par. Flor. has “while you are within”, and the garbled reading of MS H in Vitruvius supports this. Page, however, read ἐκτὸς ἰόντα (“when you go outside”), which at first sight seems necessary; for the preceding prose contexts in both **17A** and **17B**, and the parallel texts cited in n. 39 below, make it clear that the effect of the spring is to make people hate wine *subsequently*. However, the MSS text can perhaps be retained, either with the thought that the spring has the effect of making the wine that the herdsman drank *before* bathing obnoxious to him now, thus making him averse to drinking it in future — an early form of aversion therapy; or, more probably, “trouble you” may be taken as proleptic, meaning in effect “become something which will subsequently be unpleasant to you”. The expression is awkward, to be sure, but this is not great, or even highly accomplished, poetry.

that Vitruvius and the Florentine paradoxographer are not directly dependent on a single common source.³⁷ Moreover, Preger noted that there is a particular oddity in connection with the first of the three reports.³⁸ The epigram seems to suggest that the spring at Clitor is safe to drink but not to wash in; but the introductory text in both sources, and all the parallel reports,³⁹ indicate the reverse. (I assume that we can regard developing an aversion to wine as a negative effect.) But the alleged contradiction is not simply between the introductory text and the poem, for the introductory text in Vitruvius itself refers first to the negative effects of drinking and then, summarising the poem before quoting it, to those of washing. There is also, as Page notes, an odd hiatus in line 2 of the second poem.⁴⁰

As already noted, Steinmetz argues that all three poems, and the reports within which they are quoted, derive from Aristo. Page, on the other hand, discussing the dating of the poems rather than Aristo's role in the transmission as such, recognises that the second poem must be from the third century BCE because Aristo reported it, but suggests that the first and third poems may be from the second century BCE, though they could be from the third. A second-century date would make Aristo's having transmitted them unlikely.⁴¹ Page further suggests that the second poem, and probably also the first, were in origin inscriptions, the third a literary exercise. The first is explicitly described as an

³⁷ Thiel (1897) 95; Öhler (1913) 96; Page (1982) 451.

³⁸ Preger (1891) 170; Page (1982) 451–2.

³⁹ Eudoxus ap. Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 31.16; Ovid *Metaph.* 15.322ff.; Paradoxographus Palatinus 5; Phylarchus ap. Athenaeus 2.19 43F; Eudoxus ap. Stephanus of Byzantium, *Ethnica* s.v. 'Αζάνια (30.17–21 Meineke).

⁴⁰ Page (1982) 454.

⁴¹ On the chronology, cf. von Arnim (1922) 1931, suggesting that if Critolaus succeeded Aristo directly as head of the school, he may have done so in the first twenty years of the second century BCE. Öhler (1913) 77 indeed argued, following Weisshäupl, that the form of Stephanus of Byzantium's reference to Eudoxus (above, n. 39) shows that the latter part of the first of the three poems was already known to Eudoxus, even if the first four lines were a later addition:

Eudoxus in the sixth book of his *Geography of the World* says that there is a spring in Azenia, which makes those who taste its water unable to bear the smell of wine. They say that when Melampous purified the daughters of Proetus he threw the purificatory materials into it.

The inference seems questionable; the verbal parallels between the report of Eudoxus and *either* version of the epigram are not close, and that the basic story was known to both Eudoxus and the author of the epigram proves little.

inscription in both sources; the second in Vitruvius but not (explicitly) in the Florentine paradoxographer; the third in the Florentine paradoxographer but not (explicitly) in Vitruvius.

There are parallels to the report concerning Ceos, though without the poem, in the Vatican paradoxographer (33 = Aristo **17C**) and in Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 31.15 (= Aristo **17D**; citing Varro rather than Aristo).⁴² In Pliny the report concerning Ceos follows immediately after one concerning Cilicia; in the Vatican paradoxographer the report concerning Ceos is actually presented as relating to Cilicia — according to the MSS reading, at any rate. One possible explanation, suggested by Rohde,⁴³ would be that the form used for Ceos was Κία (cf. Κίος in the Florentine paradoxographer),⁴⁴ and that at some stage in the transmission leading to the Vatican paradoxographer, a scribe's eye jumped from Κιλικία to Κία. Giannini reports this explanation, but proposes rather that Κιλικία is a corruption for νήσω Κία, which is what he prints in his text.⁴⁵

Öhler argued rather that the reference to Cilicia in the Vatican paradoxographer was an attempt to correct a corrupt κιακιοι arising from dittography.⁴⁶ He supposed that Pliny and the Vatican paradoxographer did not have an immediate common source, but that the Vatican paradoxographer's report derived from the Florentine one (these being the only texts to connect Aristo *explicitly* with the report), and thus from the common source of the latter and Vitruvius (henceforth A), while Pliny's report derived from Varro, and therefore from Aristo by a route independent of the Florentine paradoxographer.⁴⁷ As Thiel had already noted, there is no mention of the spring in Cilicia either in Vitruvius or in the Florentine paradoxographer; so Rohde's explanation by *saut du même au même* is incompatible with Öhler's stemma. Whatever exactly the structure of the tradition, that Pliny on the one hand and Vitruvius and the Florentine paradoxographer on the other are ultimately depen-

⁴² Wehrli (1968) gives the reference as 31.12, but this is an error. Pliny's report is followed in turn by Isidore, *Etymologies* 13.13.3.

⁴³ Rohde (1871) 30; cf. Thiel (1897) 95, Öhler (1913) 94, Giannini (1966) 341.

⁴⁴ See Peter Stork's n. 6 to his translation of **17B**.

⁴⁵ Giannini (1966) 341 n. 33; in the apparatus criticus on 340, he records his own conjecture νήσω Κία, Wehrli's conjecture Κέω, Keller's conjecture Κεία, and Öhler's explanation by dittography (below, n. 46).

⁴⁶ Öhler (1913) 95.

⁴⁷ Öhler (1913) 95–6.

dent at least in part on a common source is however suggested⁴⁸ by the fact that at 31.16 Pliny refers to the Clitorian spring, the subject of the *first* poem in Vitruvius and in the Florentine paradoxographer. As his source Pliny cites Eudoxus; the explicit reference to a *Geography of the World* identifies this as the astronomer and mathematician Eudoxus of Cnidos.⁴⁹

Valentin Rose argued that both Varro and the Florentine paradoxographer used the paradoxographer Isigonus as a source.⁵⁰ In the case of Varro, the true relation seems to be the reverse, which enables us to date Isigonus as later than Varro but earlier than Pliny, who refers to him.⁵¹ As for the Florentine paradoxographer, while he cites Isigonus repeatedly, Thiel and Öhler are agreed that §§24–6 do not derive from Isigonus. For the Florentine paradoxographer also refers to the spring at Clitor in his §12, and attributes *that* report to Isigonus.⁵² Öhler further notes that each of §§24–6 is introduced by δέ while §§1–23 are not, this suggesting that §§24–6 are taken from a different source to what has preceded.⁵³

Öhler does not himself appear to express a view as to Aristo's involvement in the transmission of the first and third poems. But he does draw up a stemma for the transmission of the first poem,⁵⁴ arguing that Eudoxus' original report gave rise to five separate traditions. The first leads to Stephanus of Byzantium (above, n. 39). The second, via Phylarchus, splits into two, one branch leading via Isigonus to §12 of the Florentine paradoxographer (above, n. 52), the other to Athenaeus (above, n. 39). The third, via Callimachus, also splits into a branch leading to §5 of the Palatine paradoxographer (above, n. 39) and another to the entries for Κλιτόριον in the *Etymologicum Genuinum* (189.21

⁴⁸ So Öhler (1913) 94, arguing that Varro used the author who copied the three epigrams. But see further below.

⁴⁹ I am grateful to Stephen White for clarifying this point. Serbat (1972) 110 appears initially to support the identification with Eudoxus of Cnidos, but ends by saying the report seems more appropriate to the historian Eudoxus of Rhodes.

⁵⁰ And that Vitruvius used Varro. Cf. Rose (1863) 280; Thiel (1897) 93. For Isigonus see Kroll (1916).

⁵¹ Pliny, *NH* 7.12, 16, 27; cf. Thiel (1897) 94; Öhler (1913) 159–60; Kroll (1916) 2082; Page (1982) 451.

⁵² Thiel (1897) 95; Öhler (1913) 78.

⁵³ §27, explicitly attributed to Isigonus, also begins with δέ; but this may be explained by the change to a new source.

⁵⁴ Öhler (1913) 79.

Miller) and the *Etymologicum Magnum* (519.51–3 Gaisford). The fourth leads to Rufus, *Medical Questions* 12.63, copied in turn by Oribasius, *Medical Collections* 5.3.35. Most significant for the present discussion, however, is the fifth branch, which Öhler reconstructs as transmitted via an unknown source (henceforth B) and then splitting into two further branches; one in which B was the source for Varro, Varro for Pliny 31.16 (above, n. 39),⁵⁵ and Pliny in turn for Isidore, *Etymologies* 13.13.2, and another in which B was the source for a further unknown source C, which was in turn the source for the two texts that contain the poem, the Florentine paradoxographer in §24 and Vitruvius 8.3.21, and also for Ovid (above, n. 39).

What is striking about this reconstruction is that all the sources deriving from B in the fifth branch of Öhler's reconstruction of the tradition relating to Clitor are among those he regards as deriving from Aristo in the report concerning Ceos. The thought might thus naturally suggest itself that B was in fact Aristo. However, such a reconstruction requires that we accept that the group of three poems was already presented as such by Aristo; and there are problems with this view, as we have seen.

Even if B was not Aristo himself, did B's account already contain the group of three poems? Pliny, or rather Varro, couples the report concerning Clitor and that concerning Ceos (although putting the latter first; above, n. 42), and drew on B but not on A/C. That might suggest that B presented the three reports with their poems as a group,⁵⁶ and that Varro or Pliny then chose not to reproduce the poems. However, Pliny only has two of the three reports, the one concerning Ceos forming the second half of a contrasted pair attributed to Varro,⁵⁷ and that

⁵⁵ Pliny cites Varro for the report on Ceos, but Eudoxus for that on Clitor. Öhler's reconstruction thus assumes, as indeed seems reasonable, that in citing Eudoxus Pliny is still drawing on Varro as an intermediate source.

⁵⁶ It seems clear that the existence of the poems must be the reason for connecting these three particular reports. It is stretching coincidence too far to suppose that they were linked together independently of the poems, just happening to form a sequence each member of which had a ready-made poem for it; and against the supposition that the poems were composed *ad hoc* to fit the pre-existing reports is the fact that the second poem is expressly said to be reported by Aristo, that the first and second at least seem to have been inscriptions, and above all the mismatch between the first report and the first poem.

⁵⁷ The first member of the contrast being the report concerning Cilicia mentioned above at n. 42.

concerning Clitor following an intervening reference to Zama.⁵⁸ It remains possible that B contained the three poems, and that between them Varro and Pliny — who did indeed rearrange and combine material from a multiplicity of sources — omitted the poems, changed the sequence of the reports on Clitor and Ceos,⁵⁹ and omitted the report concerning Susa altogether.⁶⁰ But the balance of probabilities would seem to be against this suggestion.

The discrepancy between the prose report concerning Clitor and the poem (above, n. 38) suggests that it was the addition of this poem to a prose report which it did not quite fit that prompted the addition of the second and third poems from a source (D) which already contained all three poems.⁶¹ If we accept, for the reasons given above, that it is unlikely that all three poems were discussed by Aristo himself, then D took the second poem from Aristo. If on the other hand we allow that Aristo may have been the source for all three poems, then there seems no obstacle to identifying D with Aristo himself.

Whether Aristo is the source for all three poems or just for the second, his interest may have been in the poems rather than in the alleged phenomena on which they comment. In other words, rather than a work of scientific explanation such as Theophrastus' *On Waters* seems to have been,⁶² the work of Aristo in question — if indeed we are dealing with more than a passing reference to a single poem, the middle one of

⁵⁸ See Aristo 17D.

⁵⁹ The order in Pliny is explained by the need to put Ceos first for the sake of the contrast with Cilicia; that in Vitruvius and Par. Flor. has no such internal logic, and so is more likely to be primary. The argument of my next paragraph gives a reason to suggest that the poem concerning Clitor came first in the text that added the poems to the prose report concerning Clitor, whatever the order of the poems in the text (D) that first assembled *them*.

⁶⁰ The only other text apart from Par. Flor. and Vitruvius that has the report concerning Susa (though not the poem) is Rufus, ap. Oribasius, *Medical Collections* 5.3.30; Öhler (1913) 95–6 observes that it is unclear how the report reached Rufus.

⁶¹ That the addition of the first poem to the report on Clitor from B prompted the addition of the other two poems, rather than the group of three poems having the report from B added to the first poem, is suggested by the fact that the discrepancy would be more obvious in the second case. The poem says that drinking is safe but washing harmful; it would not be natural to add to this a prose report saying that drinking is *harmful*. But if the starting-point was the prose report that drinking is harmful, the reference to Clitor might be enough to prompt the addition of a poem introduced as saying that washing is harmful.

⁶² Steinmetz (1964) 247–78.

the three, in some context with other predominant concerns⁶³ — may rather have been a collection of literary curiosities. Certainly this would seem more in keeping with what we know of the rest of Aristo's literary activity. It also bears out, I think, the suggestion at the beginning of this paper. There are points of contact between the interests of Lyco, Hieronymus, and Aristo on the one hand, and those of the members of Aristotle's school who were more interested in natural science on the other; but the evidence does not suggest more than points of contact. As far as our evidence goes, natural science was not a primary interest of these three Peripatetics.

Epilogue: Critolaus

A change comes about with Critolaus, the probable successor of Aristo as head of the Peripatetic school in the second century BCE.⁶⁴ For he expressed views on a range of topics in physics. Some of these views are distinctly Aristotelian: the eternity of the universe (Philo, *On the Eternity of the World* 9 [6.90 and 94 Cohn] = Critolaus frs. 13 and 12 Wehrli);⁶⁵ the interpretation of time as thought or measure rather than substance (Stobaeus 1.8.40b = Critolaus fr. 14 Wehrli);⁶⁶ the imperishability of the heavens and perishability of the sublunary region (Epiphanius, *On Faith* 9.35–9 [GCS 3.508.4–15 Holl and Dummer] = Epiphanius 31–5 in Diels, *Dox.* 592.9–20 = Theophrastus fr. 162 FHS&G = Critolaus fr. 15 Wehrli).

The structure of Epiphanius' report deserves comment. He gives a report of Aristotle's views, describes Theophrastus as agreeing with Aristotle, then describes the differing views of Strato, and concludes his account of the Peripatetics by saying that Praxiphanes agreed with Theophrastus and Critolaus with Aristotle. The claim that Epiphanius ascribes certain views to Critolaus therefore rests on the fact that he ascribes them to Aristotle and says that Critolaus agreed.

⁶³ I am grateful to Hans Gottschalk for this suggestion.

⁶⁴ Above, n. 41.

⁶⁵ The argument in fr. 13 is attributed to a range of thinkers, including Pythagoras, Ocellus, Aristotle, and Theophrastus (fr. 185 FHS&G), by Censorinus, *About the Birthday* 4.2–4.

⁶⁶ For time as measure, cf. Arist. *Physics* 4.11 219b2, 4.12 220b32, and for time as dependent on thought, 4.14 223a21; cf. also Theophrastus fr. 151 FHS&G, with Sharples (1998) 62–4.

However, there may be more to the matter than that. The structure of Epiphanius' account suggests that Critolaus was Epiphanius' direct, or more probably indirect, source both for Aristotle's views and for those of the other Peripatetics cited. It is at first sight odd to say that Critolaus agreed with Aristotle, after saying that Praxiphanes agreed with Theophrastus who agreed with Aristotle — since each formulation comes to the same thing, agreement with Aristotle, why not use the same formulation? If however Critolaus formulated the report up to but not including himself, and a subsequent source added the reference to Critolaus, the incongruity is at least lessened.⁶⁷ In that case, however, the views ascribed to Aristotle are those that Critolaus ascribed to Aristotle, and the statement that Critolaus held the same views as Aristotle really amounts to the acceptance of Critolaus' claim to be an exponent of orthodox Aristotelianism; though the report as we have it in Epiphanius will only be a much-compressed second-, third- or fourth-hand account of Critolaus' views.⁶⁸

Wehrli indeed argued⁶⁹ that the report in Epiphanius is Pythagorean in origin, rather than an accurate representation of Critolaus' views, and he supports this by Cicero's claim at *On Ends* 5.14 (= Critolaus fr. 11 Wehrli)⁷⁰ that Critolaus' views differed from Aristotle's. But the context of that passage is ethics rather than physics;⁷¹ and it only claims that Critolaus diverged from Aristotle if one accepts Bremius' insertion of *<ne>*.⁷²

Epiphanius does regularly identify Pythagoreans and Peripatetics elsewhere, as Wehrli notes.⁷³ One might question whether it follows from this that his source in fr. 15 Wehrli did so. But in any case, the contrast between the imperishable heavens and the sublunary region is an authentic Aristotelian doctrine and one attributed to him by a wide

⁶⁷ Cf. Sharples (1998) 104. There is also a question why the relatively obscure Peripatetic Praxiphanes is singled out for inclusion in this company. Perhaps, as Stephen White suggests to me, as a successor in Rhodes to Eudemos?

⁶⁸ I am grateful to Sylvia Berryman and Hans Gottschalk for impressing upon me the need to consider this point.

⁶⁹ Wehrli (1969b) 66.

⁷⁰ Immediately following Hieronymus of Rhodes fr. 11 White = 8c Wehrli.

⁷¹ As indeed Wehrli (1969b) 64 notes.

⁷² See below, at n. 82–3.

⁷³ Epiphanius, *Panarion* (GCS) 1.157.6, 159.25 Holl, 186.2 Holl = Diels, *Dox.* 588.30; cf. [Epiphanius], *Anacephalaeosis* 1.165.5 Holl = Diels, *Dox.* 587.2. Wehrli (1969b) 66.

range of sources.⁷⁴ The fact that Wehrli can cite two neo-Pythagorean texts which contain this contrast ([Ocellus (Ocellus) Lucanus], *On the Nature of the Universe* 2.2.19 [15.17–23 Harder]; Anon., *Life of Pythagoras* ap. Photius, *Library* 249 439b29) does not mean either that Critolaus may not have incorporated this doctrine into his account of Aristotle, or that he was wrong to do so; and indeed Theiler suggested⁷⁵ that Critolaus was himself the inspiration of the neo-Pythagorean texts that sought to suggest that Aristotle derived his ideas from the Pythagoreans, much as the *Timaeus Locrus* did for Plato.

Epiphanius also reports, as a view of Aristotle with which Critolaus agreed, the interpretation of the soul as the actuality of the body. In fact, the text has not ἐντελέχεια “actuality” but ἐνδελέχεια “continuity”; the latter term may well in itself be authentically Aristotelian,⁷⁶ but the fact that the soul is here referred to as the ἐνδελέχεια of the *body* suggests that here at least ἐνδελέχεια is a corruption of ἐντελέχεια “actuality.”⁷⁷ The immortality of the soul, at the start of Tertullian, *On the Soul* 5.1 (= Critolaus fr. 17 Wehrli), is at least a doctrine which many have thought Aristotle held.

Other views attributed to Critolaus are less authentically Aristotelian. Epiphanius reports him as “agreeing with Aristotle” in claiming, in the manner of the Stoics — or, as David Sedley has shown us, that of the Old Academy⁷⁸ — that god and matter are the first principles. The report also includes the connection of divine providence with the heavens only, to the exclusion of the sublunary; it seems likely that Critolaus was the source of the attribution to Aristotle of this view,⁷⁹ an attribution for which there are many subsequent parallels.⁸⁰ Stobaeus 1.1.29b (Aëtius 1.7.21 [303 Diels] = Critolaus fr. 16 Wehrli) attributes to Critolaus the view that god is “intellect from impassible ether,” whatever exactly that may mean, and Tertullian, *On the Soul* 5.1 (= Critolaus

⁷⁴ Below, n. 80.

⁷⁵ Theiler (1926) 153–4; cf. Thesleff (1961) 38, (1972) 60 and 85. On [Ocellus] see also Dillon (1996) 156 n. 1.

⁷⁶ Cf. Huby (1999) 18–19.

⁷⁷ Huby (1999) 20.

⁷⁸ Sedley (2002).

⁷⁹ Cf. Wehrli (1969b) 66, with 64; Sharples (1998) 104. Mueller (1994) 155 is sceptical.

⁸⁰ Cf. e.g. Aëtius 2.3.4; Diog. Laert. 5.32; Atticus fr. 3.7–10 des Places; Theodoret, *Remedy for Greek Attitudes* 5.47, 6.7. Festugière (1932) 221–63; Moraux (1949) 33f., (1970) 54ff. For Diogenes Laertius see also below, n. 82.

fr. 17 Wehrli) and Macrobius, *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio* 1.14.20 (= Critolaus fr. 18 Wehrli) report his belief that soul too is composed of the fifth element.⁸¹

What is striking, however, is that most of these doctrines of Critolaus, with the exception of the definition of time and the treatment of god and matter as first principles, directly contradict central and distinctive doctrines of Stoicism. The Stoic doctrine of the periodic conflagration (e.g. *SVF* 1.98, 2.604–5) involves the denial of the eternity both of the universe, in the sense of the present world-order, and of the heavens; providence for Chrysippus governed the whole world, not just the heavens (e.g. *SVF* 2.937); and the soul for the Stoics was both corporeal (e.g. *SVF* 2.879) and perishable (*SVF* 2.809). Critolaus' ethics, too, oppose Stoicism; he claimed that the goal of life was made up of all three kinds of goods, those of the soul, those of the body, and external goods.⁸² While this may indeed justify Cicero's complaint in *On Ends* 5.14 that he adopted an un-Aristotelian position, Aristotle's position on the issue is not exactly clear,⁸³ and Critolaus can plausibly be seen as distorting Aristotle's views in his desire to distance them from those of the Stoics. It looks very much as if Critolaus' interest in physics too may have been a desire to reassert Aristotelian doctrines, or what he understood to be Aristotelian doctrines, as a way of asserting the distinctiveness of his school.⁸⁴ He may well not have been the first to do

⁸¹ Cf. Annas (1992) 33. It has been suggested that soul itself and ether were more closely linked in Aristotle's "published" works than in those that survive; but this is questionable; cf. Gottschalk (1980) 106–7. Cicero says that Aristotle identified the soul with ether, but this may, as Easterling (1964) argues, reflect a misunderstanding, aided by the familiarity of materialistic theories of soul in other schools, of a reference in Aristotle's early *Eudemus* to soul as a fifth *incorporeal* nature besides the *four* material elements which he recognised at that stage: see also Moraux (1963) 1206, 1229–30, and the view attributed to "some Aristotelians" by Iamblichus ap. Stobaeus 1.49.32 (1.366.25ff. Wachsmuth) = Theophrastus fr. 269 FHS&G.

⁸² Stobaeus 2.7.3b (2.46.10–20 Wachsmuth) = Critolaus fr. 19 Wehrli; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 2.21 129.10 = Critolaus fr. 20 Wehrli. The same view is attributed to Aristotle by Diog. Laert. 5.30 (cf. above, n. 80) and alluded to by Arius Didymus (?) ap. Stobaeus 2.7.14 (2.126.22–127.2 Wachsmuth). Cf. Annas (1993) 36–7, 413–18.

⁸³ Cf. Annas (1993) 36–7, 377–84, and, on Critolaus, White (2002b) 86 n. 38.

⁸⁴ David Hahn has pointed out to me that concern to identify the authentic doctrine of a school may be a more widespread tendency in the second century; cf. his remarks on the Stoics in his paper in this volume.

this; after all, Stephen White has argued⁸⁵ that even Lyco was concerned to distinguish Aristotelian positions from Stoic ones, so what is notable about Critolaus is not so much that he did this as that he did it in the context of physics. But even for Critolaus the question does arise how far it was really physics as an object of enquiry in itself that interested him, and how far rather a desire to make his statement of Aristotelianism as comprehensive as possible.

Works Cited

- Annas, J. 1992. *Hellenistic Philosophy of Mind* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- — —. 1993. *The Morality of Happiness* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- von Arnim, H. 1922. "Kritolaos (3)," *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 11.2: 1930–2.
- Callebat, L. 1973. *Vitruve: De l'architecture, Livre 8* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Capelle, W. 1927. "Lykon (14)," *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 13.2: 2303–8.
- Cougny, E. 1890. *Epigrammatum anthologia palatina: cum Planudeis et appendice nova epigrammatum veterum ex libris et marmoribus ductorum*, vol. 3 (Paris: Firmin-Didot).
- Däbritz, R. 1913. "Hieronymos (12)," *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 8.2: 1561–4.
- Dillon, J. 1996². *The Middle Platonists* (London: Duckworth).
- Dorandi, T. 1999. (ed.) *Antigone de Caryste, Fragments* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Easterling, H. J. 1964. "Quinta natura," *Museum Helveticum* 21: 73–85.
- Festugière, A.-J. 1932. *L'Idéal religieux des grecs et l'Évangile* (Paris: Gabalda).
- Flashar, H. 1991⁴. *Aristoteles: Problemata Physica = Aristoteles Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*, vol. 19 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag).

⁸⁵ See White (2002b) and (2004b).

- — —. 1972. *Aristoteles: Mirabilia = Aristoteles Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*, vol. 18.2 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. 1984. *Quellen zur Ethik Theophrasts* (Amsterdam: Grüner).
- Giannini, A. 1966. *Paradoxographorum Graecorum Reliquiae* (Milan: Istituto Editoriale Italiano).
- Glucker, J. 1998. "Theophrastus, the Academy, and the Athenian Philosophical Atmosphere," in *Theophrastus: Reappraising the Sources = RUSCH 8*, ed. J. M. van Ophuijsen and M. van Raalte (New Brunswick: Transaction), 299–316.
- Gottschalk, H. B. 1980. *Heraclides of Pontus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Huby, P. M. 1999. *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence. Commentary*, vol. 4: *Sources on Psychology* (Leiden: Brill).
- Kroll, W. 1916. "Isigonos (1)," *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 9.2: 2082.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. and P. Parsons. 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- Long, A.A. 1998. "Theophrastus and the Stoa," in *Theophrastus: Reappraising the Sources = RUSCH 8*, ed. J. M. van Ophuijsen and M. van Raalte (New Brunswick: Transaction), 355–83.
- Martano, A. 2004. "Hieronymus ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἀσπίδος Ἡσιόδου," in *Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes = RUSCH 12*, ed. W.W. Fortenbaugh and S. A. White (New Brunswick: Transaction), 457–74.
- Mirhady, D. 2001. "Dicaearchus of Messana: The Sources, Text and Translation," in *Dicaearchus of Messana = RUSCH 10*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh and E. Schütrumpf (New Brunswick: Transaction), 1–142.
- Moraux, P. 1949. "L'exposé de la philosophie d'Aristote chez Diogène Laërce," *Revue philosophique de Louvain* 47: 5–43.
- — —. 1963. "Quinta essentia," *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 24.1: 1171–1263.
- — —. 1970. *D'Aristote à Bessarion* (Québec: Les presses de l'université Laval).

- Mueller, I. 1994. "Hippolytus, Aristotle, Basilides," in *Aristotle in Late Antiquity*, ed. L. P. Schrenk (Washington: Catholic University of America Press), 143–57.
- Musso, O. 1976. "Sulla struttura del cod. Pal. gr. 398 e deduzioni storico-letterarie," *Prometheus* 2: 1–10.
- — —. 1977. (ed.) *Michele Psello: Nozioni paradossali* (Naples: Università).
- Öhler, H. 1913. *Parodoxographi Florentini Anonymi Opusculum de Aquis Mirabilibus* (Diss. Tübingen).
- Page, D. L. 1982. *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Preger, T. 1891. *Inscriptiones Graecae metricae ex inscriptionibus praeter Anthologiam collectae* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Rohde, E. 1871. "Isigoni Niceensis de rebus mirabilibus breviarium," *Acta Societatis philologiae Lipsiensis* 1: 25–42.
- Rose, V. 1863. *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Ruge, W. 1937. "Tragasai," *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 6A.2: 1893.
- Sedley, D. 2002. "The Origins of Stoic God," in *Traditions of Theology*, ed. D. Frede and A. Laks (Leiden: Brill), 41–83.
- Serbat, G. 1972. *Pline l'Ancien: Histoire naturelle, Livre 31* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Sharples, R. W. 1985. "Theophrastus on Tastes and Smells," in *Theophrastus of Eresos: On his Life and Work = RUSCH 2*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh et al. (New Brunswick: Transaction), 183–204.
- — —. 1998. *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence. Commentary*, vol. 3.1: *Sources on Physics* (Leiden: Brill).
- — —. 2000. "Science, Philosophy and Human Life in the Ancient World," in *The Proper Ambition of Science*, ed. J. Wolff and M. Stone (London: Routledge), 7–27.
- — —. 2002. "Theophrastus, *On Dizziness*," in *Theophrastus: On Sweat, Dizziness and Fatigue*, ed. W.W. Fortenbaugh et al. (Leiden: Brill), 169–249.
- Sorabji, R. 1993. *Animal Minds and Human Morals* (London: Duckworth).
- Steinmetz, P. 1964. *Die Physik des Theophrast* (Bad Homburg: Max Gehlen).

- Stork, P. 2004. "Lyco of Troas: The Sources, Text and Translation," in *Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes* = *RUSCH* 12, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh and S.A. White (New Brunswick: Transaction), 1–78.
- Theiler, W. 1926. Review of A. Delatte, *Études sur la littérature pythagoricienne* and other works, *Gnomon* 2: 147–56.
- Thesleff, H. 1961. *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period* = *Acta Academiae Aboensis, Humaniora* 24.3 (Åbo: Akademi).
- — —. 1972. "On the problem of the Doric Pseudo-Pythagorica. An alternative theory of date and purpose," in *Pseudepigrapha I: Pseudopythagorica, lettres de Platon, littérature pseudépigraphique juive*, ed. K. von Fritz (Vandoeuvres: Fondation Hardt), 57–87.
- Thiel, M. 1897. "Quibus auctoribus Vitruvius quae de mirabilibus aquis refert debeat," in *Philologische-Historische Beiträge Curt Wachsmuth zum sechzigsten Geburtstag überreicht* (Leipzig: Teubner), 92–106.
- Wehrli, F. 1968². *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 6: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (Basel: Schwabe).
- — —. 1969a². *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 8: *Eudemus von Rhodos* (Basel: Schwabe).
- — —. 1969b². *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 10: *Hieronymos von Rhodos. Kritolaos und seine Schüler* (Basel: Schwabe).
- Wenskus, O. 2000. "Paradoxographoi (I)," *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der antike* 9: 309–12.
- White, S. 2002a. "Eudemus the Naturalist," in *Eudemus of Rhodes* = *RUSCH* 11, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh and I. Bodnár (New Brunswick: Transaction), 207–41.
- — —. 2002b. "Happiness in the Hellenistic Lyceum," in *Eudaimonia and Well-Being, Apeiron* 35 Suppl., ed. L. Jost and R. Shiner, 69–93.
- — —. 2004a. "Hieronymus of Rhodes: The Sources, Text and Translation," in *Lyco of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes* = *RUSCH* 12, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh and S. A. White (New Brunswick: Transaction), 79–276.
- — —. 2004b. "Lyco and Hieronymus on the Good Life," *Ibid.* 389–409.
- Zeller, E. 1879³. *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* 2.2 (Leipzig: Fues).



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

9

Peripatetic Biology and the *Epitome* of Aristophanes of Byzantium*

Oliver Hellmann

1. Peripatetic Zoology from Theophrastus to Aristo

The foundation of scientific biology can be seen as one of the greatest achievements of Aristotle and his colleague Theophrastus. Yet this universal interest in biology, as manifested in the Aristotelian corpus and the writings of Theophrastus, was not shared by their Peripatetic successors. Biological research in the Lyceum is rare and, a fact much more important, what gets lost is the insight into Aristotle's scientific research program, which structured research into two parts: first a collection of facts, which then were interpreted primarily in regards to "form" and "function." We have here a "Hellenistic mystery," whose causes James Lennox tried to explore some years ago.¹

* This is a revised version of the paper I presented at University of Texas at Austin on March 31, 2001. For helpful comments I would like to thank Prof. G. Wöhrle, Dr. B. Herzhoff, Prof. W. Kullmann, A. Heede, Prof. S. White, Prof. R. Sharples and all participants of the conference. Special thanks I owe to Prof. H. von Staden for his response to my paper.

¹ See Lennox (1994).

Among the Peripatetic contemporaries of Theophrastus, there is evidence that Eudemus of Rhodes conducted zoological research.² In his *Apology* Apuleius cites Eudemus in an enumeration of Peripatetics who are said to have been concerned with biological problems,³ while Aelian lists a number of zoological *mirabilia* that apparently come from Eudemus (fr. 126–32 Wehrli). Biological interests are also attested for Clearchus of Soloi. His main field of research seems to have been fishes, as can be seen from his work *Περὶ τῶν ἐνύδρων*, of which several fragments are listed in Wehrli's edition (fr. 101–4 Wehrli).⁴ The title of this work indicates an increasing tendency towards specialization in the biology of particular animals. The same could be said for his monograph on the electric ray (*Περὶ νάρκης*, fr. 105 Wehrli), yet we can suppose that in both cases he was attracted by *mirabilia*. This is evident in some of Clearchus' fragments, e.g. fr. 102 Wehrli, where he reports about octopuses staying on land, or fr. 104, where he tells us about talking fishes.⁵ An interest in terminology can be detected in the fragments of his work *Περὶ σκελετῶν* (fr. 106–10 Wehrli). Phainias of Eresus, on the other hand, seems to have been a specialist in botany.⁶ There is a single fragment of his correspondence with Theophrastus which hints that he might also have been interested in zoology, but it is certainly no proof (fr. 5).⁷

Roughly a generation later, biological research in the Lyceum seems to have been intensified for the last time by Strato of Lampsacus, who followed Theophrastus as leader of the Peripatetic school. Strato concentrated his research mainly on natural science, and he produced a

² For Eudemus' biological fragments see Zeller (1963) 870 n. 1; Wehrli (1969d) 112f.; Wehrli (1983) 530f.; Sorabji (1993) 46 with n. 99; Althoff (1999) 156f. and especially White (2002).

³ Apul. *Apol.* 36 (= Eudemus fr. 125 Wehrli = Lyco fr. 15 SFOD = 30 Wehrli).

⁴ For Clearchus cf. Kroll (1921) 580–3; Wehrli (1969a) 81–3; Wehrli (1983) 547–51 esp. 550; Althoff (1999) 157–9.

⁵ A similar paradoxographic report is fr. 36 Wehrli from a work entitled *Περὶ τοῦ πανικοῦ*; on this cf. Althoff (1999) 158. It must be always kept in mind that our picture of Eudemus and Clearchus is deeply influenced by the selective adaptation of their writings, and this reflects primarily the interests of the receptors. Cf. Sharples (1995) 32 with n. 84 and White (2002). For similar tendencies to *mirabilia* in the case of Theophrastus cf. Kullmann (1999) 185f.

⁶ Cf. fr. 36–50 Wehrli from his work *Περὶ φυτῶν*.

⁷ A skeptical view is held by Wehrli (1969e) 28 on fr. 5, a positive one by Althoff (1999) 159.

number of biological works. Unfortunately, in most cases we know nothing more than their titles, which were recorded by Diogenes Laertius (5.59). Two of Strato's works apparently treated strictly of zoological matters. The topic of one, *Περὶ τῶν ἀπορουμένων ζώων* (fr. 92 Wehrli), may have been animals with peculiarities not easy to explain for the ancient biologists, and the other, *Περὶ τῶν μυθολογούμενων ζώων* (fr. 93 Wehrli), probably did not deal with animals occurring in myth, like the Scylla or Chimaera,⁸ but instead the "legendary reports of specific characteristics of real animals."⁹ Strato's work, then, confirms that there was an increasing interest in the investigation of biological peculiarities and astonishing phenomena. Of Strato's other works on physiology and medicine,¹⁰ I will restrict myself to naming *Περὶ ζωογονίας*, which deals with reproduction.¹¹ Several fragments of this work have been preserved (fr. 94–9 Wehrli). Strato's research is of special interest for our discussion, as his work as an educator and teacher of Ptolemaios II Philadelphos in Alexandria proves a direct connection between the Peripatetic school in Athens and the Alexandrian library (D.L. 5.59).¹² "S[trato]'s stay in the royal residence was," as Wilhelm Capelle said, "without doubt of highest importance for the transplantation of Greek science to Alexandria"¹³ and, one could add, may have inspired biological work there.

As the main topic of this volume is Strato's Peripatetic successors, I would now like to move on to Lyco, who according to Apuleius was also interested in zoological matters.¹⁴ Wehrli takes as further evidence for scientific interests fr. 28 (= 13 SFOD), a passage in Herodianus'

⁸ This was the assumption of Capelle (1931) 281.

⁹ See Wehrli (1969b) 69, Althoff (1999) 162. Wehrli and Althoff cite the use of the verb *μυθολογεῖσθαι* in Aristotle (e.g. *HA* 6.29 578b23; 9.1 609b10). A similar use is also found in Aristophanes 2.380 (p. 110.2 Lambros). Cf. also White (2002) 216 n. 33.

¹⁰ See fr. 94–106 Wehrli.

¹¹ It cannot be decided whether Strato treated solely the reproduction of animals or included also man and /or plants. Cf. Wehrli (1969b) 69; Althoff (1999) 162; Capelle (1931) 280 assumed that spontaneous creation may have been the topic of this work.

¹² Cf. Wehrli (1983) 569: "Die Tatsache nämlich, dass der ägyptische König Ptolemaios I. Lagu ihn zur Erziehung seines Sohnes, Ptolemaios II. Philadelphos, nach Alexandria berief, setzt voraus, dass er dank seiner Schulzugehörigkeit bereits ein gewisses Ansehen erlangt hatte." For relations between the Peripatos and Alexandria see von Staden (1997).

¹³ Capelle (1931) 279.

¹⁴ *Apol.* 36, cf. above, n. 3.

work Περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομάτων, where he treats the use of the rare word ἄλας for salt.¹⁵ But this cannot be a definite proof.¹⁶ Wehrli himself considers the possibility that Apuleius “took the name of the first Peripatetic at hand” for his enumeration of Peripatetic biologists.¹⁷ Furthermore, the fact that there are no further reports about biological writings led Capelle to suppose that Apuleius confused Lyco with Strato.¹⁸ Stephen White has proposed a mix-up with Lycos of Rhegium, whose works also included descriptions of animals.¹⁹ All this seems plausible, but since there exists no further evidence, it is impossible to make a secure decision.

Nothing is known about any zoological interests of Hieronymus of Rhodes²⁰ or Aristo of Ceos. The absence of information suggests that the Peripatetics of this era were not interested in the subject.²¹ The situation was different in Alexandria, where at about the same time Aristophanes of Byzantium prepared a compilation of Aristotle’s zoological writings, known as the *Epitome*. This work would greatly influence the transmission of Peripatetic biological knowledge.

2. The *Epitome* of Aristophanes of Byzantium

The compilation made by the famous Alexandrian grammarian originally included 4 books. Excerpts of the first and second have been preserved in zoological writings produced under the patronage of the Byzantine emperor Konstantinos Porphyrogennetos.²² In this work, material from Aelian, Timotheus, and others was added to Aristophanes’ *Epitome*, as

¹⁵ Cf. also Pseudo-Arist. *Mir.* 138 844b16 and Sharples in this volume.

¹⁶ Wehrli (1969c) 26 on fr. 28 argues that the repetition of the word ἄλας for salt makes it probable that this word is not only used here as a comparison, but must be the main topic, and so the fragment is part of a work dealing with natural science. But this cannot be proven without doubt.

¹⁷ Wehrli (1969c) 26 on fr. 30 = 15 SFOD.

¹⁸ See Capelle (1927) 2306. Wehrli (1983) 577 also concedes this.

¹⁹ See White (2002) 209 n. 6.

²⁰ For an interpretation of Hieronymus fr. 45 White (= fr. 29 Wehrli) see Martano (2004) 460f. and Sharples in this volume.

²¹ Moraux (1951) 312f. argues that this could explain why out of all the biological works of Aristotle only the *Historia animalium* seems to have been known in Athens c. 200 BCE.

²² Edited by Lambros (1885).

recorded in the heading.²³ In the last part the different sources are clearly marked off by the author (starting 2.283, p. 96.28 Lambros); in the first, there are no explicit attributions. Lambros, the editor, has separated the different sources,²⁴ but his attributions are not absolutely certain.²⁵

Another problem is that we cannot know for sure how the Byzantine author worked. His text is called a “collection” (*sullogê*) in the heading. As Sharples rightly remarks, “the term *sullogê* does not perhaps in itself imply that Constantine shortened Aristophanes’ work,” but “what is included from Aelian is certainly a collection of (re-arranged) extracts.”²⁶ In the case of Aristophanes, the situation could be different. We have a single papyrus-fragment of the original Aristophanes text,²⁷ and a comparison of the fully preserved first column with the Byzantine collection (2.169–71) seems to indicate that Aristophanes’ text has been copied in its entirety.²⁸ But the passage (about nine lines in the edition of Lambros) is too short to draw conclusions for the whole work. As a result, the Byzantine text needs to be handled with care. However, I will speak of Aristophanes as the author of the passages I discuss in detail, since in these cases the attribution to him seems secure.²⁹

²³ *Epit.* p. 1.4–6 Lambros: Ἀριστοφάνους τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ζώων ἐπιτομή, ὑποτεθέντων ἐκάστω ζῳῳ καὶ τῶν Αἰλιανῶ καὶ Τιμοθέω καὶ ἑτέροις τισὶ περὶ αὐτῶν εἰρημένων.

²⁴ See Lambros (1885) Praefatio xvi–xvii.

²⁵ In his response H. von Staden pointed out that a reconsideration of the attributions is needed especially for the section 1.1–2.39.

²⁶ Sharples (1995) 36 n. 104.

²⁷ *P.Lit.Lond.* 164 corresponding to 2.169–76 Lambros. See Roselli (1979) and (1989). Cf. Slater (1982) 341 n. 28. For a refutation of Slater’s overall thesis about Aristophanes and the museum, see Blank and Dyck (1984).

²⁸ Presenting the results of her comparison Roselli (1979) 14 speaks of “numerosae varianti,” but in most cases these are minor changes. The only major omission in the Byzantine text (col. 1.15–19) seems to be an error of the scribe caused by a repetition of the same verb-form (cf. σκυζᾷ ll. 15 and 19).

²⁹ It seems highly plausible to me that the introductory parts of the first and second book, on which I concentrate in this section, come directly from Aristophanes, because the author is explaining his treatment of Aristotelian texts. In the second book, which deals with single animal species and on which I will focus in the next section, the attributions are less problematic. As clearly stated in the heading (cf. above n. 23), Aristophanes comes first, followed by material from Aelian and other authors. The beginning of the Aelian-sections can be easily seen by means of the apparatus of parallels in Lambros’ edition.

At the beginning of Book 1 the author, presumably Aristophanes, directly addresses his readers, declaring that they have to have knowledge of Aristotle's naming and classification³⁰ of animals:

Ταῦτά ἐστιν ἐν τῇ νῦν γραφομένη ὑφ' ἡμῶν συντάξει ἃ δεήσει σε ἐπιγῶναι, τίνα λέγει ὁ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ περὶ ζῴων πραγματείᾳ σελάχια ζῶα καὶ τίνα μαλάκια, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τίνα μαλακόστρακα κατονομάζει [1.1, p. 1.12–14 Lambros]

The following is what you will have to know in our written composition: namely, which animals Aristotle calls *selachia* in his treatise on animals, which *malakia*, furthermore, which (animals) he names *malakostraka*.³¹

Besides the *selachia*, *malakia*, and *malakostraka*, he also names 18 further groups of animals and defines them mainly by morphological qualities. It is striking that the last group to be named by Aristophanes, the *holosphyra*, or the animals with undivided ankles, cannot be found in any of Aristotle's writings, despite the fact that Aristophanes explicitly refers to Aristotle as his source.³² This gives us a first clue that the *Epitome* may also contain non-Aristotelian material.³³

With this fundamental classification in mind, Aristophanes tells us, the readers will have an easier time following the subsequent information.

τοιαύτης γὰρ τῆς ὑποτυπώσεως γινομένης εὐεπίγνωστος μᾶλλον καὶ ἡ τῶν κατὰ μέρος γένηταί σοι ἱστορία. [1.1 p. 1.19f. Lambros]

³⁰ Cf. 1.27 p. 6.4 Lambros, where he speaks of διαίρεσις.

³¹ Translations are mine, unless otherwise noted.

³² The word occurs in Aristophanes' *Epitome* for the first time in Greek Literature. In his response, H. von Staden noted that the expression σελάχια (see 1.1 and 1.2, p. 1.12 and 1.21 Lambros) cannot be found in the Aristotelian corpus. Aristotle uses the form σελάχη. Similar cases are the words δόρκων (see 1.15, p. 3.15 Lambros) and πλατυώνυχια (see 1.17, p. 4.3 Lambros). The expression ἀμφίβια (see 1.11, p. 3.3 Lambros) is attributed to Aristotle by Athenaeus (7 306B = Arist. fr. 320 Rose³ = 211 Gigon). It is used by Theophrastus (e.g. *HP* 1.4.3 and *On Fishes* 12, p. 366.104–5 Sharples) and might be wrongly attributed to Aristotle through the use of some kind of compilation of Peripatetic material.

³³ Heitz (1865) 225 remarked that in the fragments of the ζωικά, a collection cited by a number of ancient authorities that could be one of Aristophanes' sources, one finds a number of similar terms, which cannot be found in Aristotle's writings.

³⁴ For the reception of these definitions see Aelian 11.37 and *Suda* s.vv. Cf. De Stefani (1904) 422 and 442f.

If this pattern is used, the observation in detail will be easier for you to comprehend.

Definitions of the mentioned groups of animals (1.2–22)³⁴ and some new ones (1.23–6) are then given in the subsequent chapters.³⁵ Strikingly, there is no description of the *holosphyra*. In sum, the introductory section shows that Aristophanes up to this point is still following Aristotle's paths. He requires basic knowledge of Aristotle's divisions for his work.

A summary treatment of the propagation and birth of various animals and a collection of animal habits make up the rest of the first book (1.27–155). At the beginning of Book 2, Aristophanes finally comes to his main purpose:

Ἐν τῇδε τῇ συντάξει, τὸν ἀριθμὸν οὔση δευτέρα, πειράσομαι, προγράφων περὶ οὗ ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος ζώου ὄνομα, προσυποτάσσειν τούτῳ ὅσα τὸ προταχθὲν ζῶον μόρια κέκηται, εἶτα περὶ τῆς ὁχείας αὐτοῦ καὶ πόσους κύειν δύναται μῆνας, περὶ τε τῆς ἐκτέξεως ποῖα καὶ πόσα ὑπομένει τίκτειν βρέφη· ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ τίς ὁ βίος τοῦ προγραφέντος ζώου καὶ ποῖον τὸ ἦθος καὶ πόσα δύναται ζῆν ἔτη.³⁶ [2.1, p. 35.18–36.3 Lambros]

In this composition, the second in number, after giving the name of the animal, I will try to place under this heading how many parts the proposed animal has, then I will [speak] about its mating and how many months it is able to be pregnant, and concerning its birth, what kind of young and how many [of them] it is able to bear. In all cases [I will explain] the life of the animal named in the heading, what its character is like, and how many years it is able to live.

Here, the most important innovation, which would subsequently have major consequences for the field of biology, is the rearrangement³⁷ from an order by “parts,” as in Aristotle, to an order by species, as Aristophanes prefers.³⁸ The impulse for this rearrangement may have

³⁵ The end of this section is clearly marked by the author himself. Cf. the first sentence of 1.27, p. 6.4 Lambros: Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τῆς διαιρέσεως ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον (“So much for definitions”).

³⁶ For an interpretation of this section see now Kullmann (1999) 187. Cf. De Stefani (1904) 431f.

³⁷ Rearrangement is one of the characteristic features of the genus *Epitome*. Cf. Opelt (1962) 961: “Das nach dem Weglassen wesentlichste Mittel ist die Umgruppierung der aus der Vorlage gewonnenen Exzerpte, die dem Epitomator als Bausteine zu seinem neuen Ganzen dienen.”

³⁸ On the other hand, the information about each single species is arranged accord-

come from the order of material in Aristotle's works themselves, since it does not easily allow for finding information on single species.³⁹ This hypothesis is confirmed by Aristophanes himself, when he gives the reasons for his arrangement immediately after the previous quotation:

τοῦτο δὲ ἐπειράσθην ποιῆσαι, ἵνα μὴ διηρημένην ἐν πολλοῖς τὴν ὑπὸ Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ζῴων πραγματείαν ἐπιπορεύῃ, συνηγμένην δὲ ὁμοῦ πᾶσαν τὴν ἐφ' ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ ζῳῷ ἱστορίαν ἔχῃς. [2.1, p. 36.3–5 Lambros]

This I tried to do, in order that you need not go through Aristotle's treatise on animals which is divided into many parts, but you can have the entire enquiry about each single animal brought together.

After this general methodological introduction at the beginning of Book 2, Aristophanes gives a structural overview for the rest of his work. He intends to treat viviparous animals in the rest of Book 2, starting with animals that have toes, followed by cloven-hoofed animals, animals with a single hoof, then cartilaginous fish,⁴⁰ followed by oviparous animals, beginning there with (the other kinds of) fishes.⁴¹ From this it can be inferred that birds were the topic of Book 4.⁴² With this structure Aristophanes preserves the "scientific" zoological classification into animals with toes, cloven-hoofed animals, and animals with a single hoof, as Wolfgang Kullmann has shown.⁴³ But immediately

ing to the overall-structure of *HA*: parts: 1–4, reproduction: 5–7, life: 8, character: 9; cf. *HA* 5.1 538b27–539a2, 8.1 588a16–8, 9.1 608a11, Peck (1965) xci–xciii and Louis (1964) xxii–xxxii; this structure reflects the hierarchy of soul functions (cf. *de An.* 2.3 414a29–415a13 and Lloyd [1996] 49–52). I owe this point to Stephen White, who remarked that he does not know whether Aristophanes was aware of this.

³⁹ Cf. Kullmann (1999) 186 and Gotthelf (1988).

⁴⁰ 2.2, p. 36.6–10 Lambros: Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἃ μὲν τῶν ζῴων ζῳοτοκεῖ, ἃ δὲ ῥοτοκεῖ, ἃ δὲ σκωληκοτοκεῖ, πειράσσομαι μὲν ἐν τούτῳ περὶ μόνων τῶν ζῳοτοκούντων τὸν λόγον ποιήσασθαι, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῶν πολυσχιδῶν, ἐχομένως δὲ περὶ τῶν διχελῶν, εἴτα περὶ τῶν μονύχων, ἐπὶ πᾶσι δὲ δηλώσω καὶ περὶ τῶν σελαχιδῶν λεγομένων ἰχθύων, ἐπειδὴ καὶ αὐτοὶ δοκοῦσι ζῳοτοκεῖν.

⁴¹ 2.3, p. 36.11–13 Lambros: ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἐχομέναις ταύτῃ δυσὶ συντάξεσι περὶ τῶν ῥοτοκούντων ὁμοιοειδῶς τούτοις τὸν λόγον ποιήσσομαι, τὴν ἀρχὴν λαβὼν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνύδρων.

⁴² For the content of the lost Books 3 and 4 and the internal references of the *Epitome*, which seem to dissent (p. 5.3; 7.4; 7.10; 11.14 Lambros) see Lambros (1885) viiif.; Rose (1863) 282f., De Stefani (1904) 425f., 441 and Kullmann (1999) 186.

⁴³ Kullmann (1999) 191f., who also demonstrates that basic structures of the arrangement of topics in Aristophanes can be seen also in Pliny's work.

after this introduction the fundamental differences between Aristophanes and Aristotle start to appear, when Aristophanes adds a marginal note:

τὸ δὲ [περὶ] τῶν σκωληκοτοκούντων εἶδος ὥς λεπτὸν καὶ ἀσθενὲς καὶ οὐκ ἄξιον ἱστορίας παραιτήσομαι. [2.3, p. 36.13f. Lambros]

I will omit the genus of animals which produce grubs, as they are small and weak and not worth observation.

To make the difference clear, consider Aristotle's famous invitation to scientific biology in *On Parts of Animals* 1.5:

διὸ δεῖ μὴ δυσχεραίνειν παιδικῶς τὴν περὶ τῶν ἀτιμοτέρων ζώων ἐπίσκεψιν· ἐν πᾶσι γὰρ τοῖς φυσικοῖς ἔνεστί τι θαυμαστόν. [645a15–7]⁴⁴

Wherefore we must not betake ourselves to the consideration of the meaner animals with bad grace, as though we were children; since in all natural things there is something of the marvellous. [Translation A. L. Peck]

Here Aristotle's primary goal is, of course, to establish animals as a field of research equal to other parts of nature, as for example celestial bodies. But the statement can also be interpreted as a call for enquiry into all kinds of animals, as indeed Aristotle did. This general perspective is ignored by Aristophanes, for whom there is nothing marvelous about animals that produce grubs.

3. The Work of the *Epitomator*

To illustrate the work of the Alexandrian epitomator, I have selected two animals described in the second book of the *Epitome*, the wolf and the hedgehog.⁴⁵ The following tables — first the wolf — are based on the apparatus of the Lambros edition and show parallels between the passages of the Byzantine text attributed to Aristophanes and the description in the Aristotelian corpus:

⁴⁴ *De partibus animalium* here and in what follows is cited from the Loeb edition by Peck.

⁴⁵ The choice of these species has been made with a view to the last part of this paper, where Aristophanes' *Epitome* will be compared with a modern handbook of biology. I have chosen two animals described by Aristophanes that can be identified with species recognized in modern biological classification.

1. *The wolf* (ὁ λύκος)

Aristophanes (2.207–16, p. 85.7–22 Lambros)	Aristotle
(207) Ὁ λύκος ἔστι μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς καρχαρόδους	HA 8.5 594a25–7: Τῶν δὲ τετραπόδων καὶ ζωοτοκούντων τὰ μὲν ἄγρια καὶ καρχαρόδοντα πάντα σαρκοφάγα· πλὴν τοὺς λύκους φασὶν ὅταν πεινῶσιν ἐσθίειν τινὰ γῆν, ... ⁴⁶
καὶ τῶν πολυσχιδῶν,	GA 2.6 742a8f.: ἔτι δ' ὅσα πολυσχιδῇ τῶν τετραπόδων, οἷον κύων λέων λύκος ... ⁴⁷ [cf. GA 3.4 771a21f.]
βαδίζει δὲ κατὰ διάμετρον.	HA 1.5 490b3f.: πάντα δὲ κινεῖται ὁμοίως, τὰ τετράποδα καὶ πολύποδα· κατὰ διάμετρον γὰρ κινεῖται. ⁴⁸ [cf. HA 2.1 498b5f.]
(208) ἔχει δὲ τὸν αὐχένα <u>μονοσπόν-</u> <u>δυλον</u> , καθάπερ ὁ λέων.	PA 4.10 686a20–2: τοῖς μὲν οὖν ἄλλοις ἐστὶ καμπτὸς καὶ σφονδύλους ἔχων, οἱ δὲ λύκοι καὶ λέοντες μονόστουν τὸν αὐχένα ἔχουσιν.
(209) αἰδοῖον δὲ ἔχει ὀστῶδες <u>καθαρὸν</u> καθάπερ ὁ ἀλώπηξ καὶ ἡ γαλῆ.	HA 2.1 500b23–4: τὰ δ' ὀστώδη [τὰ αἰδοῖα], ὥσπερ ἀλώπεκος καὶ λύκου καὶ ἱκτιδος καὶ γαλῆς.
(210) <u>ἀνατμηθεὶς δὲ ἔχει γλῶτταν</u> <u>μεγάλην καὶ παχείαν, πνεύμονα ὀκτά-</u> <u>λοβον, ἥπαρ ἐξάλοβον, κοιλίαν κυνὸς</u> <u>ὁμοίαν, τὰ δ' ἄλλα ὅμοια κυνί.</u> ⁴⁹	

⁴⁶ Books 7–10 of the *History of Animals* here and in what follows are cited from the edition of Balme (1991). Nevertheless, I do not adopt Balme's rearrangement of Books 7–10, but keep the traditional order.

⁴⁷ *De generatione animalium* here and in what follows is cited from the edition of Peck.

⁴⁸ Books 1–6 of the *History of Animals* here and in what follows are cited from the edition of Peck.

⁴⁹ As a parallel, not a model, cf. HA 2.17 507b15–7: Τὰ δ' ἀμφόδοντα μίαν ἔχει κοιλίαν, οἷον ἄνθρωπος, ὕς, κύων, ἄρκτος, λέων, λύκος, ἔχει δὲ καὶ ὁ θῶς πάντα τὰ ἐντὸς ὅμοια λύκῳ.

(211) ὀχεύεται δὲ καὶ ὀχεύει ὁ λύκος (κατὰ μίαν ὥραν), ⁵⁰ τὰ δ' ἄλλα πράσσει περὶ τὴν ἔκτεξιν ὅμοια κυνί.	HA 6.3 580a11–13: Λύκος δὲ κύει μὲν καὶ τίκτει καθάπερ κύων τῷ χρόνῳ καὶ τῷ πλήθει τῶν γινομένων, καὶ τυφλὰ τίκτει ὥσπερ κύων· ὀχεύει δὲ καὶ ὀχεύεται κατὰ μίαν ὥραν, ...
(212) ἴδιον δὲ ἔχει τοῦτο· καὶ καρχαρόδους γὰρ ὑπάρχων, ἔστι καὶ σαρκοφάγος.	HA 8.5 594a25–7: τῶν δὲ τετραπόδων καὶ ζωοτοκούντων τὰ μὲν ἄγρια καὶ καρχαρόδοντα πάντα σαρκοφάγα. πλην τοὺς λύκους φασὶν ὅταν πεινώσιν ἐσθίειν τινὰ γῆν, ...
(213) ἐπιτίθεται δὲ μᾶλλον μὲν ὄνφ, εἶτα βοί,	HA 9.1 609b1–3: λύκος δ' ὄνφ καὶ ταύρῳ καὶ ἀλώπεκι πολέμιος· ὠμο- φάγος γὰρ ὢν ἐπιτίθεται τοῖς βουσὶ καὶ τοῖς ὄνοις καὶ τῇ ἀλώπεκι.
καὶ κατὰ φλέβα λύων αἰμοποτεῖ.	
(214) λέγεται δὲ τοὺς μονολύκους καὶ ἀνθρώποις ἐπιτιθεμένους σαρκοφα- εῖν.	HA 8.5 594a29–31: ἀνθρωποφαγοῦσι δ' οἱ μονοπεῖραι τῶν λύκων μᾶλλον αὐτῶν ἢ τὰ κυνηγέσια.
(215) Ἱστορεῖ δὲ περὶ τὴν Μαιῶτιν λίμνην τοὺς λύκους ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον συνήθεις εἶναι τοῖς τὴν ἄγρην τῶν ἰχθύων ποιουμένοις, ὥστε καὶ συναν- αιρεῖσθαι τοῖς ἰχθυοθήραις τῶν ληφθέντων τοὺς ἡμίσεις. εἰ δέ ποτε μὴ δῶσι δοκοῦντες λήσεσθαι, τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν ψυχόμενα κατασχίζουσι.	HA 9.36 620b5–8: καὶ περὶ τὴν Μαιῶτιν δὲ λίμνην τοὺς λύκους φασὶ συνήθεις εἶναι τοῖς ποιουμένοις τὴν θήραν τῶν ἰχθύων· ὅταν δὲ μὴ μεταδιδῶσι, δια- φθεῖρουν αὐτῶν τὰ δίκτυα ξηραινό- μενα ἐν τῇ γῇ. ⁵¹
(216) <u>Ζῆ δὲ ὁ λύκος ὅσα περ καὶ ὁ κύων ἔτη.</u>	

⁵⁰ Supplemented by Lambros from HA 6.35 580a13. As the text of Aristophanes clearly derives from HA 6 and does not make sense without the supplement, I agree with it.

⁵¹ Cf. Antigonos, *Mir.* 27: φησὶν περὶ Κωνόπιον τῆς Μαιώτιδος λίμνης τοὺς λύκους παρὰ τῶν ἀλιέων λαμβάνοντας τροφὴν φυλάττειν τὴν θήραν· ἂν δ' ὑπολάβωσιν τι ἀδικεῖσθαι, λυμαίνεσθαι τὰ λῖνα καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας αὐτῶν. A comparison with the above cited text of Aristophanes shows that Aristophanes is much closer to Aristotle than Antigonos, especially in wording.

The comparison shows that parallels for most of Aristophanes' information can be found in Aristotle's *History of Animals*, *Parts of Animals*, and *Generation of Animals*. Most of these derive from the *History of Animals*. Only the words underlined are not found in Aristotle.

The most important words not found in Aristotle are those giving the results of a dissection (210). Explanations of this kind can be found regularly in the second book, in each case introduced by a significant participle (here: ἀνατμηθείς, elsewhere: ἀναπτυχθεῖσα, διοιχθείς, ἀνασχισθεῖσα).⁵² This emphasis on anatomy strongly suggests that Aristophanes had access to the now lost Ἀνατομαί mentioned in the lists of Aristotle's works. The Ἀνατομαί are in fact explicitly mentioned by Aristophanes in Book 2.29 (p. 41.11 Lambros). In addition to drawings, this work gave short explanations which may indeed have been the source of Aristophanes' sometimes very condensed text.⁵³

Aristophanes provides more information than we have from Aristotle by mentioning the habit of drinking blood (213) and the wolf's life span (216). Difficult to explain is his formulation αἰδοῖον δὲ ἔχει ὅστωδες καθάρων (2.209, p. 85.9 Lambros). The adjective καθάρων is missing in the cited section of the *History of Animals* (HA 2.1 500b23–4) which was probably Aristophanes' source, and it cannot be found in any other author in connection with the word αἰδοῖον. Its meaning therefore remains unclear.⁵⁴

If one then takes a look at all references to wolves in the biological writings of Aristotle, it becomes clear that Aristotle provides much more information in the 19 passages he dedicates to this animal.⁵⁵ He

⁵² In this context, Aristophanes often refers to similarities in the anatomic structures of dogs or pigs and the animals he describes; cf. Lambros (1885) xv with n. 2.

⁵³ Cf. now Hellmann (2004).

⁵⁴ Further peculiarities in wording seem to be worth mention. First, the adjective μονοσπόνδυλον (2.208, p. 85.8 Lambros) which, according to TLG #E, is found only once in Greek literature apart from our text (Hippiatrica, *Excerpta Lugdunensia* 9.16, ed. Oder/Hoppe, vol. 2, p. 275.13). Yet it can be easily explained as a short version of the Aristotelian phrase τοῖς μὲν οὖν ἄλλοις ἐστὶ ... σπονδύλους ἔχων, οἱ δὲ λύκοι καὶ λέοντες μονόσπουτον τὸν αὐχένα ἔχουσιν (PA 4.10 686a20–2). Secondly the expression μονόλυκοι, found also in Aelian (NA 7.47) seems to correspond to the Aristotelian formulation οἱ μονοπεῖραι τῶν λύκων. But Aelian defines it differently: ὁ δὲ τέλειος καὶ μέγιστος καλοῖτο ἄν μονόλυκος.

⁵⁵ HA 1.1 488a28; HA 2.1 500b23f.; HA 2.17 507b15–7; HA 5.2 540a8–10; HA 6.18 571b26–30; HA 6.35 580a11–22; HA 8.5 594a26–31; HA 8.28 606a21–7; HA 8.28 607a1–3; HA 9.1 609b1–3; HA 9.6 612b2; HA 9.36 620b5–8; PA 4.10 686a20–4; PA

provides additional physiological details, e.g., that the wolf has five toes on the forefeet and four on the hind, which can be explained, in his opinion, by the use of the forefeet as hands.⁵⁶ About copulation and birth, he reports that the wolf gives birth to many young (*GA* 3.4 771a21f.) and that these are blind, like the young of all animals with many toes (*GA* 2.6 742a8–10). Birth takes place in summer, and Aristotle adds the legendary tale that all wolves give birth over a period of 12 days: within this time Leto is said to have come as a wolf from the Hyperboreans to Delos. Aristotle believes this story as little as he does the one about wolves giving birth only once in their lifetime (*HA* 6.35 580a11–22). In two passages, he calls attention to the specific detail that wolves also copulate with dogs, though being of a different species. This can happen, he thinks, if the animals are nearly the same size and the duration of their pregnancy is almost equal. It happens mostly in Africa, where a lot of animals come together at springs (*GA* 2.7 746a29–b11; *HA* 8.28 607a1–3). He goes on to report about the nutrition of wolves: only this species of all carnivorous animals sometimes eats a special kind of dirt and if they are feeling sick, they eat grass, just as dogs do. (*HA* 8.5 594a26–9). Their behavior is described as always aggressive, especially in the mating season; yet fighting among one another is rare, since wolves do not live in herds (*HA* 6.18 571b26–30).⁵⁷

This comparison shows that the information given by Aristotle is more comprehensive and more detailed than the report of Aristophanes. In most cases the wolf is introduced as an example for a whole group of animals. This corresponds to Aristotle's theoretical reflections on presenting results of scientific research in his work *Parts of Animals* 1, where he refuses to treat each single species on its own. On the contrary, the common attributes among animal groups are to be treated only once in order to avoid repetitions (*PA* 1.1 639a15–b6; 1.5 644a23–b7).⁵⁸

4.10 688a5–6; *GA* 2.6 742a8–10; *GA* 2.7 746a29–b11; *GA* 3.4 771a21–2. Cf. also: *EE* 7.1 1235a8–9; *Pol.* 8.4 1338b30–1; *Phgn.* 6 811a17; *Mir.* 83 836b27–9; fr. 253 Rose³.

⁵⁶ Cf. *PA* 4.10 687b28–688a8.

⁵⁷ The Egyptian wolf, mentioned in *HA* 8.28 606a21–7, seems to be a different species. See Bonitz (1961) 439 s.v. λύκος; Aubert and Wimmer (1868) 1.73: "Schakal oder *Canis Simensis*."

⁵⁸ Cf. Kullmann (1998) 108f.

Yet the main difference is that Aristotle's explanations are based on his research program with its definite methods and goals.⁵⁹ In the *History of Animals*, he presents a collection of biological facts as a first step in this program. The second step, the enquiry into causes, is given in his *Parts of Animals*, *Generation of Animals*, and *Progression of Animals*. A good example is his explanation for the wolf's having only one neckbone. For him, this anatomical peculiarity is caused by the function of the wolf's neck: "for Nature's object was to provide these with a neck that should be useful for its strength rather than for other purposes" (translation Peck).⁶⁰ Aristophanes, on the other hand, is not interested in a search for causes of this kind. In this case, he confines himself to reporting on anatomic detail. Therefore, it is clear that he has used the *History of Animals* as his primary source. As a collection of facts, this work provides the kind of information he wants to present to his readers.

Finally, the interest in *mirabilia* seems to be no greater in the case of the *Epitome* than in the works of Aristotle. Aristophanes adopts the story about the symbiosis of wolves and men in the region of the Maiotis lake (215; *HA* 9.36 620b5–8), but ignores the myth about the birth of all wolves occurring in a span of 12 days and does not add any further *mirabilia*.⁶¹ Of course, one must resist drawing firm conclusions *ex silentio*, since we have no clear knowledge about the transmission of Aristophanes' text.⁶² We do not know whether the shortened text of the Byzantine manuscript is an excerpt made by Aristophanes himself or by someone else later. It seems highly probable that Aristophanes was not interested in complicated aitiological arguments like those found in the works of Aristotle. As he himself states, his goal is to give his readers quick information about single species.

Let us see now if the observations made for the wolf can also be verified in the case of the hedgehog.

⁵⁹ Kullmann (1998) 55–70.

⁶⁰ *PA* 4.10 686a22–3: ἔβλεψε γὰρ ἡ φύσις ὅπως πρὸς τὴν ἰσχὺν χρήσιμον αὐτὸν ἔχουσι [sc. λύκοι καὶ λέοντες] μᾶλλον ἢ πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας βοηθείας.

⁶¹ This is also the opinion of Fraser (1972) vol. 1, 781 on Aristophanes' work: "This epitome is not more paradoxographical than the original work of Aristotle."

⁶² See above section 2 *ad init.*

2. *The hedgehog* (ἐχῖνος ὁ χερσαῖος)

Aristophanes (2.424–27, p. 118.14–25 Lambros)	Aristotle
(424) Ἐχῖνος ὁ χερσαῖος πόδας μὲν ἔχει πενταδακτύλους, καθάπερ καὶ ἡ ἄρκτος, ῥύγχος ὕψος, ὀδόντας οὐς μὲν προβάτου, οὐς δὲ κυνός·	
μαστοὺς ἐπτά, εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ πέντε καὶ εἰς τὰ ἀριστερὰ δύο· κέρκον μικρὰν καὶ αἰδοῖον ὑποκείμενον· τῆς δὲ μήτρας τὸ αἰδοῖον ὕψος.	
(425) ἀνατμηθεὶς δέ, γλῶσσαν μὲν οὐκ ἔχει μεγάλην, τὰ δ' ἄλλα σπλάγχνα ὅμοια ὑί, σπλῆνα δὲ λίαν μέλανα, ὅμοιον τῷ τοῦ ἵππου.	
(426) τοὺς δὲ ὄρχεις ὁ ἄρρην ἔχει ἕσω πρὸς τῇ ὀσφύϊ καθάπερ οἱ ἀλεκτρυόνες·	HA 3.1 509b5–9: οἱ δ' ὄρνιθες ἔχουσι μὲν ὄρχεις, ἔχουσι δ' ἐντὸς πρὸς τῇ ὀσφύϊ. καὶ τῶν τετραπόδων ὅσα φωτοκεῖ, τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχει τρόπον ... καὶ τῶν ζωοτόκων ἐχῖνος. GA 1.5 717b26–8: Πάντα δ' ἔχει τὰ ζωντόκα τοὺς ὄρχεις ἐν τῷ πρόσθεν [ἢ ἔξω], πλὴν ἐχίνου· οὗτος δὲ πρὸς τῇ ὀσφύϊ μόνος, ... ⁶³
ἡ δὲ θήλεια τὴν ὑστέραν δίκρουν.	
(427) λέγεται δὲ τὸ ζῶον τοῦτο προμεταβάλλειν τὰς ἰδίας ὁπὰς, καὶ ὅταν μὲν βόρεια μέλλῃ πνεῖν, εἰς τὰ νότια, ὅταν δὲ νότια εἰς τὰ βόρεια. ὅθεν κατανοήσαντά τινα τὸ γινόμενον [ὑπὸ] τῶν ἐν Βυζαντίῳ προλέγειν τοῖς πολίταις τοὺς μέλλοντας ἀνέμους πνεῖν, καὶ οὕτω δόξαν ἀπενέγκασθαι οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν.	HA 9.6 612b4–10: περὶ δὲ τῆς τῶν ἐχίνων αἰσθήσεως συμβέβηκε πολλὰ τοῦ θεωρηθῆναι ὅτι μεταβαλλόντων βορέων καὶ νότων οἱ μὲν ἐν τῇ γῇ τὰς ὁπὰς αὐτῶν μετακινοῦσιν, οἱ δ' ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις τρεφόμενοι μεταβάλλουσι πρὸς τοὺς τοίχους, ⁶⁴ ὥστ' ἐν Βυζαντίῳ γέ τινα φασι προλέγοντα λαβεῖν δόξαν ἐκ τοῦ κατανενοηκέναι ποιοῦντα ταῦτα τὸν ἐχῖνον.

⁶³ Immediately after this, Aristotle tries to explain this phenomenon: διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν δι' ἣν περ καὶ οἱ ὄρνιθες, ταχὺν γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον γίνεσθαι τὸν συνδυασμὸν αὐτῶν· οὐ γὰρ ὥσπερ τὰ ἄλλα τετράποδα ἐπὶ τὰ πρᾶν ἡ ἐπιβαίνει, ἀλλ' ὀρθοὶ μίγνυνται διὰ τὰς ἀκάνθας.

The comparison for the hedgehog shows that only two pieces of information given by Aristophanes can also be found in Aristotle's works, namely, the descriptions of the inside testicles (426) and the movement of the entrances of the burrows when the weather changes — a phenomenon which was used by a clever man in Byzantium to forecast the weather (427).⁶⁵ For all other information about the physiology and anatomy of the hedgehog (424 and 425), no close parallels in Aristotle can be found.

The hedgehog is mentioned nine times in the known Aristotelian texts, but Aristotle's interest focuses mainly on four characteristic qualities: the hedgehog's spines, its internal testicles, its habit of copulating in a standing position, and its specific sensory abilities. The most striking quality, the hedgehog's spines, is mentioned several times in the *History of Animals*. Aristotle classifies them as a kind of hair (*HA* 3.11 517b21–5). As proof of this, he points to the fact that the spines have the same function as hair. This categorization confirms his statement that all viviparous animals have hair (*HA* 1.6 490b27–30).⁶⁶ The spines are then used for the explanation of other phenomena. First, the internal testicles of the hedgehog, mentioned in *History of Animals* 3.1 (509b5–9), are seen in *Generation of Animals* 1.5 (717b26–31) as a necessary condition for quick copulation. Here one must know that shortly before this Aristotle had stated his theory of copulation. In animals with external testicles, the genitals would warm up by movement, and due to the heat the seed is collected and ejected, while in animals with internal testicles, the seed is ready immediately. Hedgehogs need to be able to copulate fast due to their spines. Another cause is given in *Generation of Animals* 1.12 (719b15–17), where Aristotle explains that the skin of the hedgehog is not suitable to provide a scrotum as a separate protective part for the testicles. But the testicles need protection, so they are situated internally. In *Generation of Animals* 1.5 (717b30f.)

⁶⁴ This passage seems to indicate that hedgehogs were kept as domestic animals, presumably to catch snakes or insects inside the house. Cf. Hünemörder (1998) 923.

⁶⁵ This story is told in many later sources. Cf. Pseudo-Arist. *Mir.* 8 831a15–8; Plut. *Soll. an.* 972A; Ael. *NA* 3.10; Thphr. *Sign.* 30; Basil. *In Hex.* 9.3, p. 151.2–5 de Mendieta and Rudberg; Plin. *NH* 8.133. Sider (2002) 110 remarks: "Hedgehogs do ..., according to one scientist, close up whichever opening to their underground lair faces the wind," referring to K. Herter, "The insectivores," in Grzimek (1975) 209.

⁶⁶ The last point is stated again in *GA* 5.3 781b32–5. In *HA* 6.37 581a1–2 Aristotle reports that mice in Egypt have hair like hedgehogs.

the spines are also seen as the cause for copulation in an upright position, a fact mentioned already in *History of Animals* 5.2 (540a3f.).

The ultimate goal of Aristotelian biology, to explain zoological phenomena by causes, is obvious here. In this respect, another aspect also deserves our attention: nearly all characteristics of the hedgehog described in *History of Animals*⁶⁷ are adapted in Aristotle's aitiological writings for his causal explanations. So it seems obvious that Aristotle selected the facts presented in the *History of Animals* for later use in his aitiological research.

But where do the physiological details mentioned in Aristophanes' *Epitome* but missing in Aristotle's works come from? A clue for the answer might come from the Pseudo-Aristotelian *Mirabilia* (65 835a26), where we are told that the hedgehog is able to survive a whole year without nourishment. Hellmut Flashar says in his commentary⁶⁸ that the source probably was Theophrastus' work *On Creatures that Hide* (Περὶ τῶν φωλεύοντων), because the same information is linked with hibernation in Aelian's *De Natura Animalium* 3.10.⁶⁹ It is certainly possible that Aristophanes excerpted information from this work, either directly or through an intermediate source.⁷⁰ However, one could object that Aristophanes never mentions hibernation in this part of his work.

4. The *Epitome*, a Popular Handbook of Biology?

It seems clear that Aristophanes' zoological work is based primarily on Aristotle's zoological writing, including the now lost *Anatomai*, supplemented by material from the lost writings of Theophrastus and perhaps other Peripatetic writers or compilations of Peripatetic material.⁷¹ Yet

⁶⁷ The only exception is the miraculous story about the hedgehog's remarkable sensory qualities (*HA* 9.6 612b4–10).

⁶⁸ See Flashar (1990) 99 on chapter 65. Cf. also Rose (1863) 368f.

⁶⁹ Cf. Erasistratus, fr. 75 Garofalo (= Gal. *De venae sect. adv. Erasistratum* 9, vol. 11, 183.14–185.5 Kühn).

⁷⁰ In general Kroll (1940) 29.

⁷¹ Including perhaps the lost *Zoica* attributed to Aristotle, to which Apollonius *Mir.* 27 and Athenaeus in several places refer. Rose (1886) 215 and De Stefani (1904) held that this collection is identical with Aristophanes' *Epitome*, but Kroll (1940) denied this. The question is not settled, but there are signs that indicate the existence of a collection of Aristotelian material before Aristophanes. Cf. now Kullmann (1999) 187–9 and Sharples (1995) 34–7.

Aristophanes' work differs fundamentally in character from the known Aristotelian writings.

This leads us to ask what intentions Aristophanes had in writing this work, who his readers were, and how they used his *Epitome*. It has been proposed that it was mainly his lexicographic and literary interests that motivated him to write his *Epitome*, an exceptional work in his literary corpus.⁷² In pursuing such interests, he would be following the tradition of his teacher Callimachus, who wrote a lexicographic work *On Birds* (Περὶ ὀρνέων).⁷³ One may certainly agree that Aristophanes did not do any biological research himself, and that he had no scientific ambitions in this field. Yet, despite the differences from his scientific sources, his work seems worth reading as a biological treatise in its own right. Since Aristophanes presents his readers with a minor work⁷⁴ designed to give them quick information about single animal species, a comparison with modern zoological handbook suggests itself. For this purpose, I have chosen a work from Gordon Corbet and Denys Ovenden, entitled *The Mammals of Britain and Europe*, first published in 1980.⁷⁵ With its 253 pages, this work is not very extensive, and its selection of species corresponds approximately to Aristophanes' second book, in which he treats viviparous animals.

The work of Corbet and Ovenden, available in paperback edition, is structured as follows. An introductory section (p. 7–21) gives instructions for the use of the book and general information about the principal topic, namely mammals. The main section is divided into two parts. The first gives color plates of the various species and maps showing their geographic range, along with short texts and drawings of tracks, signs, droppings, skulls, and teeth (p. 22–118). In the second part of the main text, the species are treated more fully, approximately 1 1/2 pages per animal (p. 119–217).⁷⁶ A comparison of the sections dealing with the wolf shows that Aristophanes' chapter is shorter: 150 words in Aristophanes, but 391 words in Corbet and Ovenden. At the end of the modern handbook is a "Checklist of European mammals" listing their scientific and English names and their range, followed by a special

⁷² Cf. Kroll (1940) 30, Sharples (1995) 35, Kullmann (1999) 189.

⁷³ Fr. 414–28 Pf. Cf. Kullmann (1999) 189.

⁷⁴ Cf. above, section 2.

⁷⁵ Corbet and Ovenden (1982).

⁷⁶ One may assume that this division was also made for economic reasons, because only the first part is printed in color.

section about mammals in England, a glossary, bibliography, and index (p. 218–53). I would now like to focus on the two parts of the main section of this book, using again the wolf and the hedgehog as examples.

In the treatment of wolves and dogs (p. 64–5), in the first part pictures of animal species appear on the right side, while the maps showing the range of the species and short descriptions of their external appearance and size appear on the left. In some cases, including the hedgehog (p. 22–3), additional drawings give further details, such as the characteristic defensive position of the hedgehog. The authors state their intentions on the inside cover under the heading “The illustrations.”

The plates in full color feature 186 mammalian species, including seasonal and sexual variations, which will enable the reader to identify most animals that are sighted. Text facing these plates gives diagnostic details.

The goal is explicitly stated: the illustrations enable the readers to identify animals which they have observed themselves.⁷⁷

If one searches for similarities in Aristophanes’ text, nothing of the kind can be found. His texts only give rudimentary, incomplete physiological information that does not suffice to identify animals that were sighted. About the physiology of the wolf, for example, we are only told that he has saw-like teeth, feet with many toes, that he moves his legs cross-corner-wise, and that he has only a single bone in the neck, like the lion (2.207–8). More is said about the hedgehog,⁷⁸ but even then the information does not suffice to identify the species by sight. In both cases, nothing is said about such fundamental characteristics as size, color, or shape of the animal. Furthermore, there are no pictures to help readers in identifying their sightings. Theoretically, this could be explained by a fragmentary transmission of the text, but there are no signs in the text referring to pictures or plates, so it is justified to assume that there were no plates or drawings added to the text in Alexandrian times.

⁷⁷ Cf. p. 7 in the section “How to use this book”: “Most good sightings, as well as animals found dead, should be identifiable from the colour plates.”

⁷⁸ He is said to have 5 toes, a snout like a pig, his teeth partly like a sheep, partly like a dog, 7 nipples, 5 to the right and 2 to the left, a little tail, and underneath this, the genitals. Finally, on the female, the genitals are said to be like those of the pig (2.424).

In contrast to the modern work, it was not Aristophanes' goal to give his readers the material needed to identify animals observed in nature. They must already know the species under discussion.

On the inside cover, Cobet and Ovenden clearly state the goals of their main text:

The main text describes the appearance and physiology of every mammalian species which lives in a wild state in Europe west of the USSR, and discusses their range, habitat and habits.

Here, the general outline is partly similar to Aristophanes' announcements in the first paragraph of his second book,⁷⁹ where he proclaims he will talk about the number of parts of the animal, mating and birth, habits, character, and lifetime.

Now the question is: Can these general similarities be observed within the text itself? Aristophanes begins his treatment of the wolf by categorizing the species according to the Aristotelian classification.⁸⁰ The wolf is said to have saw-like teeth (καρχαρόδους) and feet with many toes (πολυσχιδών, 2.207, p. 85.7 Lambros). In the modern handbook, a similar categorization is given by the headings in hierarchical order that follow the modern system of biological taxonomy. Accordingly, the wolf is classified in the order of Carnivores (*Carnivora*) and the family of Dogs and Foxes (*Canidae*), which indicates the main characteristics for each hierarchical group (cf. p. 176–7).⁸¹ The Carnivores are said to “vary greatly in size and shape, ... but most are predators” (p. 176). The characteristic teeth, which were also noted by Aristophanes, are described in detail:

They all have continuous rows of teeth, each row sharply demarcated into three small incisors, a large, conical canine or fang, and a variable number of cheek-teeth of which one, known as the carnassial is usually especially large and blade-like, for shearing flesh. [p. 176]

⁷⁹ Cited above, section 2.

⁸⁰ As defined already in the first book.

⁸¹ This system is explained in the paragraph “How to use this book” (p. 8): “When using the main text, note that in some cases a considerable amount of information that is common to a number of species is given under the preceding heading of the genus, family or order.”

After a short remark on the coat of the carnivores, which is said to be mostly soft and dense, Cobet and Ovenden concentrate on populations. Due to persecution and hunting, a lot of species have been “seriously depleted.” Because they are “secretive and nocturnal,” “they are consequently difficult to detect and observe,” but footprints and droppings can give hints (p. 176).

As characteristics of the family of Dogs and Foxes, we are told that they “tend to be fast runners with long legs, long muzzles and prominent ears” (p. 177).⁸² There are no parallels to this in Aristophanes, who only mentions their cross-corner-wise mode of walking⁸³ (2.207, p. 85.8 Lambros).⁸⁴

The physiological description of the wolf is finally given by Cobet and Ovenden under the heading “Identification” (p. 177–8). Here selected details are listed, in order to avoid confusion with similar species such as the Alsatian or jackal. The selection of information is clearly designed to guarantee a definite identification.⁸⁵ Aristophanes’ report gives physiological details as well, for instance concerning the neck and genitals of the wolf (2.208 and 209), but no clear goal for his selection is apparent.

The following paragraphs in the modern handbook inform about the range and habitat of the wolves (p. 178). Aristophanes says nothing on these topics, nor does his long section about internal parts (2.210) have parallels in the modern work. But it is worth noting that Aristophanes ends his anatomical description of the wolf with a comparison of its parts with those of a dog: “He [the wolf] has a stomach similar to that of a dog, and the other parts are also similar to those of a dog” (κοιλίαν κυνὸς ὁμοίαν, τὰ δ’ ἄλλα ὅμοια κυνί, p. 85.11f. Lambros).⁸⁶ Cobet

⁸² The additional information about domestic dogs is not relevant for our discussion.

⁸³ Aristotle explains this expression in *IA* 14 712a24–8: κινεῖται δὲ τὰ ὀπίσθια πρὸς τὰ ἔμπροσθεν κατὰ διάμετρον· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ δεξιὸν τῶν ἔμπροσθεν τὸ ἀριστερὸν τῶν ὀπίσθεν κινουῦσιν, εἴτα τὸ ἀριστερὸν τῶν ἔμπροσθεν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο τὸ δεξιὸν τῶν ὀπίσθεν.

⁸⁴ In the German edition (p. 183) the feet of the Canidae are described in a manner that is similar to Aristophanes’ description: “Zehengänger, Vorderfüße mit 5, Hinterfüße mit 4 Zehen, Krallen kurz und stumpf.”

⁸⁵ Cf. p. 20: “a large part of the main text of this book, dealing with individual species or groups, is devoted to identification features.”

⁸⁶ Cf. also 2.211, p. 85.13 Lambros: τὰ δ’ ἄλλα πράσσει περὶ τὴν ἔκτεξιν ὅμοια κυνί. For comparisons of the inner parts of humans with those of animals in Aristotle, cf. von Staden (1989) 139–40.

and Ovenden make a similar comparison in their last paragraph about the behavior of wolves, bringing attention to the fact that “many traits of the domestic dog such as tail-wagging as a greeting, the bristling and growling of a dog asserting his dominance, and the flattened ears and tail-between-legs of a submissive animal are also found in wild wolves” (p. 178). It is evident that the modern authors refer to the existing knowledge and observations of their readers to illustrate their descriptions. Aristophanes’ Alexandrian readers, on the other hand, had probably never seen a dissection of a dog or a wolf; but they could get more information out of the work in the paragraph about dogs. So Aristophanes’ comparison can be identified as an intratextual reference.

Much is said both in Aristophanes and in the modern handbook about the habits of wolves. Cobet and Ovenden first give a long description about the social life in family groups (p. 178). Aristophanes does not explicitly treat this topic, but by mentioning the *μονόλυκοι* (2.214, p. 85.16 Lambros) as a special kind of wolf, he implies that he is aware of the animal’s tendency towards social organization. Other primary topics are reproduction and nutrition. Following Aristotle, Aristophanes once again refers to dogs, while Cobet and Ovenden give detailed information on their birth in dens and the assistance of the male in rearing the young (p. 178). Closer parallels can be recognized in the field of nutrition. Here Aristophanes’ formulation “[The wolf] eats meat; he attacks mainly donkeys, then cows” (ἔστι καὶ σαρκοφάγος. ἐπιτίθεται δὲ μᾶλλον μὲν ὄνῳ, εἶτα βοί, 2.212–3, p. 85.14f. Lambros) is closely paralleled in the modern handbook:

Typically wolves cooperate in hunting deer and other ungulates, especially in winter, but smaller items of prey such as hares, birds and rodents are also eaten as is carrion. [p. 178]

In this case, the apparent differences can be partly explained by the distinct perspectives of the various authors. Aristophanes is talking about the Mediterranean region only, while Cobet and Ovenden treat the animals of the whole of Europe.

Finally, one question seems to have remained of interest at least since the time of Aristophanes: Do wolves also attack humans? Aristophanes says yes, but with the cautious formulation “it is said” (λέγεται, 2.214, p. 85.16 Lambros). Today, judgments are different: “Unprovoked attacks by wolves on people are almost unknown” (p. 178), but even nowadays, there seems to be room for exceptions.

In his closing section (2.215) Aristophanes reports the miraculous story about the symbiosis of wolves with men near the Maiotis lake. Since *mirabilia* are found at the end of the descriptions of several species,⁸⁷ one gets the impression that his contemporary readers were interested in such stories, an interest which they might well share with the readers of a modern handbook. Alas, modern readers of Cobet and Ovenden have to do without, as the work has scientific aims. Nor do they get any information about the wolves' lifespan, which I find surprising, since this seems to be the kind of information they would appreciate.

In the case of the hedgehog, Aristophanes' text (2.424–7) is centered on physiology and anatomy. As I have already mentioned, he describes the animal's feet, snout, teeth, nipples, tail, and genitals (2.424 and 426) as well as its inside parts, beginning with the characteristic participle ἀνατμηθείς (2.425). He does not mention their classification within the group of animals with many toes, but a reader with some knowledge should recognize this, since Aristophanes mentions that the animal has five toes.

The treatment of the hedgehog in the work of Cobet and Ovenden is structured according to the pattern used to describe the wolf. In the introductory paragraphs, the order Insectivores (*Insectivora*) and the family of the hedgehogs (*Erinaceidae*) are characterized (p. 120). Here it is worth mentioning that two characteristic qualities of the Insectivores, namely their long snout and their feet, are also described by Aristophanes. Especially interesting is the comparison between the modern authors, who write “there are five digits on each foot” (p. 120) with Aristophanes: “The hedgehog has feet with 5 toes” (Ἐχῖνος ὁ χερσαῖος πόδας μὲν ἔχει πενταδακτύλους, 2.424, p. 118.14f. Lambros).⁸⁸

The relevance of the modern work to its own time becomes obvious when Cobet and Ovenden point out that hedgehogs are “very vulnerable to road accidents” and “frequently found killed on roads” (p. 120). Of course hedgehogs in antiquity were not threatened by such dangers.

⁸⁷ Cf. 2.146, 175, 250, 333, 347, 380, 387, 427, 457, 488–91, 581. In his response, H. von Staden marked out the author's special interest in singularity, which is connected to the tradition of *mirabilia*. Note the frequent repetition of μόνος in 1.98–113 (p. 29.18–31.8 Lambros), which has been called “un'enumerazione di ιδιότητες ἀνθρώπου” by De Stefani (1904) 431.

⁸⁸ Cf. also Cobet and Ovenden (p. 120) “in all of them [sc. the insectivores] the snout is rather elongate” and Aristophanes (2.424, p. 118.15 Lambros): “[the hedgehog has] a snout like a pig” (ρύγχος ὅς).

After this critical remark, the authors present three species of hedgehogs distinguished by modern taxonomy. All are similar in their external appearance but differ in their geographic range. In our context, the “Western Hedgehog” (*Erinaceus europaeus*, p. 120) living in the western regions of Europe, and the “Eastern Hedgehog” (*Erinaceus concolor*, p. 121), living in the east, are of special interest.⁸⁹ In the ancient authors, no such differentiation is made. In fact, it was not until the nineteenth century that these two species were differentiated. In their section on “Identification,” Cobet and Ovenden point out that they differ only by the color of their breast and their skulls, which are not visible on living individuals (p. 120). Nevertheless we can assume that Aristophanes’ explanations concern the Eastern hedgehog because in Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean today only the Eastern Hedgehog can be found, and it is not likely that the geographic range of the species has changed fundamentally since antiquity.⁹⁰ For the present discussion, this problem is only of secondary importance, as the main differences were not discussed by Aristophanes, and the habitat and habits of both species are identical, as Cobet and Ovenden tell us.⁹¹

As the hedgehog’s preferred areas of habitat Cobet and Ovenden cite woodland with ground vegetation, grassland, hedgerows and scrub, gardens, parks, etc. The reader is informed, as well, that hedgehogs can also live in regions with an altitude of up to 2000 meters, such as in the Alps (p. 120). Nothing like this can be found in the *Epitome*. This confirms our thesis that the ancient work was not concerned with animal-observation, since the information that is missing would be necessary if the goal were to find and observe the animals.

About the habits of the hedgehog, Aristophanes reports the story about the hedgehog’s shifting the openings of its dwellings, when the winds change (2.427). Further information on propagation and birth though promised in the introduction is missing.⁹² Cobet and Ovenden,

⁸⁹ Cf. the map (p. 22) with the geographical range of the species.

⁹⁰ In opposite to this, the modern works dealing with the identification of ancient descriptions vote for the “Western Hedgehog” (*Erinaceus europaeus*). See Bonitz (1961) 306, Aubert and Wimmer (1868) 1.68, Hünemörder (1998) 923.

⁹¹ See Cobet and Ovenden, p. 121 (on the “Eastern Hedgehog”): “Habitat and habits. As for the Western hedgehog.”

⁹² One could interpret this as a sign of a selective reception of the text of Aristophanes in Byzantine times. But cf. above section 2.

on the other hand, answer questions about the birthing season, the offspring's first few weeks of life, and its nourishment (p. 120). They also tell us about hibernation and give specific details, such as decreases in body temperature and pulse (p. 120) as well as the animal's defensive position in times of danger (p. 120, cf. the plate on p. 23). Aristophanes says nothing about this characteristic behavior in cases of danger. Unlike his main source, Aristotle, he does not even mention the characteristic spines.

To sum up: As can be seen from this comparison of selected passages, there are several common features in the *Epitome* of Aristophanes and the modern handbook of Cobet and Ovenden. First, there are the common themes, such as reproduction, nutrition and, habits. Second, the texts are quite similar in the physiological information noted. Finally, both works classify their animals according to a contemporary system of classification.

The choice of information is highly selective in both works, especially the physiological information. This is partly due to the limits the authors themselves set for their works. Yet for the modern handbook, this may be explained primarily by the ultimate goal of autopsy and identification of animals in the wild. To achieve this goal, readers get detailed information for finding animals, for example in the search for footprints, whereby the authors propose to "prepare a section of path by spreading sand or mud," and the use of bait or traps (p. 18–20). Pictures and texts deliver all information necessary for subsequent identification of the animals sighted. In the case of Aristophanes, one gets the impression that his selection of information is arbitrary. Sometimes his information exceeds that of the modern handbook, especially in the anatomical descriptions of internal parts. His detailed description of these reflects the literary goals of Aristophanes the epitomator, who relies solely on the information provided by his sources. Because he used scientific sources, we can speak of Aristophanes' work as having its basis in scientific facts. But it is not scientific "in the strict sense," because it excludes any demonstration of causes, which was Aristotle's ultimate goal.⁹³ Aristophanes' work should rather be considered "popu-

⁹³ In his response, H. von Staden drew attention to the fact that there are no signs of such key terms as διαφοράι or uniform and non-uniform parts (ὁμοιομερῆ and ἀνομοιομερῆ), that are essentials for the Aristotelian arrangement of material.

lar”⁹⁴ in the sense that it tries to facilitate the acquisition of information by rearranging the material for a wider audience. His work is also unscientific, because it does not present the results of scientific research in a way that is comprehensible for non-experts. The achievements and results of Aristotle’s biological research cannot be discerned from Aristophanes’ *Epitome*.

And on this point, we face another mystery. What was the use of this *Epitome* for its Hellenistic readers? As I have tried to show by my comparison, the hypothesis that it was used as a guide for animal observations must be rejected. So one might then suppose that ancient readers simply enjoyed reading about previously unknown scientific data, now conveniently arranged by species. Although plausible at first sight, this is unsatisfactory because Aristophanes removes the scientific information from its given context but apparently neglects to supply a new one. He is indeed highly concerned that his work has an easily comprehensible structure. But in practice, disparate and sometimes very detailed information stands side by side.

The arrangement by species suggests another use for the *Epitome*, namely, as a reference book or lexicon.⁹⁵ Anyone who is satisfied with the material at hand can quickly find information about a single species by means of the new form of presentation. In this case, we must assume that the users only read parts of the work at a time. This seems plausible, if we think of the succinct, monotone style of the work. We may thus imagine the *Epitome*’s readers as members of the learned circles, such as a *poeta doctus*, in search of material for describing an animal in a poetical work but uninterested in scientific biology. One may think here of Nicander of Colophon, although due to the condition of the sources, it cannot be proven that he used Aristophanes’ work. Unfortunately, we do not have any descriptions of snakes by Aristophanes, and the species treated in Aristophanes’ second book mentioned by Nicander do not allow us to decide the question.⁹⁶ Therefore, we can only speculate about a *poeta doctus* using the *Epitome*.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ Of course, one must always keep in mind that reading in the time of Aristophanes was still a privilege of the elites, as H. von Staden emphasized.

⁹⁵ Cf. Kullmann (1999) 189.

⁹⁶ Nicander mentions the following species: λέων, *Ther.* 171; μυγαλή, *Ther.* 816; γαλή, *Ther.* 689; ἰκτίς, *Ther.* 196; ἀλώπηξ, *Alex.* 185; ἔλαφος, *Ther.* 36, 101, 139, 579, 586; ἵππος, *Ther.* 422, 635, 669, 740, 741. The observation mentioned by Aristophanes

At least it is obvious that the arrangement of information given by Aristophanes⁹⁸ is a fundamental threat to scientific biology as Aristotle had practiced it, and might also be seen as its end. No one could comprehend the facts adopted by Aristophanes without their Aristotelian context. So the frequent reception of Aristophanes' *Epitome* in later times, on the one hand, guaranteed, a transmission of Aristotelian ma-

(2.387, p. 112.9) that the ἔκτις (yellow-breasted marten?) eats birds has parallels in a poetic description of Nicander (*Ther.* 195–99), but this unspecific detail cannot prove a connection between these texts. Arist. (*HA* 9.6 612b14) mentions this too. On the other hand, Nicander's details about the stomachs of a deer (*Ther.* 579f.) seem to differ from the reports of Aristophanes (2.481 p. 126.10f. Lambros) as well as Aristotle (*PA* 3.14 674b7–15). The same can be said about Nicander's explanation of the origin of wasps (*Ther.* 741) which is different from Aristotle's report (*GA* 1.16 721a2–5). Another candidate could be Poseidippus, who wrote a number of epigrams treating augury (*P.Mil.Vogl.* 8 309, col. 4.7–6.8 Bastianini, 134–50).

⁹⁷ That *P.Oxy.* 221 (Grenfell and Hunt, p. 52–85 = Erbse (1977) 78–121, Pap. 12) could be a piece of evidence for a reception of Aristophanes in learned cycles was proposed by H. von Staden at the conference in Austin. The papyrus contains scholia to *Iliad* 21.1–516; its author seems to be Ammonius, a grammarian who worked in Alexandria in the second half of the second century BCE. In two passages the text names Aristotle as its source for biological explanations. The topic of the first passage (col. 9.36–10.15) is eels. The source of the first part (col. 9.36–10.11) seems to be *HA* 6.16 570a3–11. The second part is attributed to Aristotle under the authority of Didymus, and has parallels in *HA* 8.2 592a23–4. The last sentence (col. 10.14–15) gives information that can be found in *GA* 2.5 741a38f. The use of different sources and the rearrangement of material, noted already by Grenfell and Hunt, 80 (on col. 9.37: "The quotation varies the order of the sentences") indicate the use of some kind of collection. Furthermore, the arrangement of topics corresponds to the order presented by Aristophanes in 2.1: col. 9.36–10.4: propagation / generation, col. 10.4–13: sort of life (and generation), col. 10.13–14: lifespan. In the second passage (col. 13.30–9) Aristotle's name has been supplied at the end of line 30 by Grenfell and Hunt. In the next few lines only the first letters of each line are decipherable. Finally, starting 1.35, there follows a literally quotation of *HA* 9.32 618b28–31. Erbse, 104 in his apparatus on 1.30 remarked: "neque tamen vestigia 1.32–3 verbis Aristotelis conveniunt, quae inde a voce καλεῖται (1.35) verbatim laudantur. Alia eiusdem auctoris in 1.34–5 circumscripta esse possunt (quod demonstrari nequit)." His alternative suggestion was that Democritus might be the name given in l. 30, referring to Porph. *Hom. Quaest.* 1.274.11). The use of a collection could solve the problems in this case too, since the information given in the first lines could come from another passage. Finally one may add that Aristophanes is mentioned by name shortly before this (l. 20) for an alternative reading.

⁹⁸ We cannot tell whether Aristophanes was the first to arrange the information in this way. Cf. Kullmann (1999) 187f.

terial. But on the other hand, it must be seen as an endpoint: the turning away from scientific biology whose beginning can be detected in the Peripatetic school itself.

Works Cited

- Althoff, J. 1999. "Biologie im Zeitalter des Hellenismus," in *Geschichte der Mathematik und der Naturwissenschaften in der Antike*, vol. 1: *Biologie*, ed. G. Wöhrle (Stuttgart: Steiner), 155–80.
- Aubert, H. and F. Wimmer. 1868. *Aristoteles Thierkunde* (Leipzig: Engelmann).
- Balme, D. 1991. *Aristotle: History of Animals, Books 7–10* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Bastianini, G., C. Gallazzi, C. Austin. 2001. *Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309)* = Papiri dell'Università degli Studi di Milano 8 (Milan: Facolta di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Milano).
- Blank, D. and A. Dyck. 1984. "Aristophanes of Byzantium and Problem-Solving in the Museum: Notes on a Recent Reassessment," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 56: 17–24.
- Bonitz, H. 1870. *Index Aristotelicus* (Berlin: Reimer).
- Capelle, W. 1927. "Lykon (14)," *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 13.2: 2303–8.
- — —. 1931. "Straton (13)," *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 4A: 278–315.
- Corbet, G. and D. Oviden. 1980. *The Mammals of Britain and Europe* (London: Collins); German trans. by R. Kraft, *Pareys Buch der Säugetiere. Alle wildlebenden Säugetiere Europas* (Hamburg-Berlin, 1982).
- Erbse, H. 1977. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (Scholia vetera)*, vol. 5 (Berlin: De Gruyter).
- Flashar, H. 1990. *Aristoteles: Mirabilia = Aristoteles Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*, vol. 18.2 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).
- Fraser, P. M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Gothelf, A. 1988. "Historiae I: Plantarum et animalium," in *Theophrastean Studies = RUSCH* 3, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh et al. (New Brunswick: Transaction), 100–35.

- Grenfell, B. P. and A. S. Hunt. 1899. *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part 2 (London: Egypt Exploration Fund).
- Heitz, E. 1865. *Die verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Hellmann, O. "'Multimedia' im Lykeion? Zu Funktionen der Anatomai in der aristotelischen Biologie," *Antike Naturwissenschaft und ihre Rezeption* 14: 65–86.
- Hünemörder, C. 1998. "Igel," *Der neue Pauly* 5: 923.
- Kroll, W. 1921. "Klearchos (11)," *Paulys Realencyclopädie* 11.1: 580–3.
- — —. 1940. *Zur Geschichte der aristotelischen Zoologie* = Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, phil.-hist. Klasse, 218.2. Abhandlung. (Wien: Hölder).
- Kullmann, W. 1998. *Aristoteles und die moderne Wissenschaft* (Stuttgart: Steiner).
- — —. 1999. "Zoologische Sammelwerke in der Antike," in *Geschichte der Mathematik und der Naturwissenschaften in der Antike*, vol. 1: *Biologie*, ed. G. Wöhrle (Stuttgart: Steiner), 181–98.
- Lambros, S. P. 1885. *Excerptorum Constantini de natura animalium libri duo. Aristophanis historiae animalium epitome subiunctis Aeliani, Timothei aliorumque eclogis* = Supplementum Aristotelicum 1 (Berlin: Reimer).
- Lennox, J. 1994. "The Disappearance of Aristotle's Biology: A Hellenistic Mystery," *Apeiron* 27: 7–24.
- Lloyd, G. E. R. 1996. "The Relationship of Psychology and Zoology," in Lloyd, *Aristotelian Explorations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 38–66.
- Louis, P. 1964. *Aristote: Histoire des animaux I–4* (Paris: Les belles lettres).
- Martano, A. 2004. "Hieronymus ἐν ὑπομνήματι Ἀσπίδος — Ἡσιόδου," in *Lycy of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes* = *RUSCH* 12, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh, S. A. White (New Brunswick: Transaction), 457–74.
- Morau, P. 1951. *Les listes anciennes des ouvrages d'Aristote* (Louvain: Éditions Universitaires de Louvain).
- Opelt, I. 1962. "Epitome," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 5 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann), 944–73.

- Peck, A. 1965. *Aristotle: Historia animalium 1–3* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Rose, V. 1863. *Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- — —. 1886. *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Roselli, A. 1979. “Un frammento dell’ Epitome Περὶ ζῴων di Aristofane di Bisanzio. *P. Lit. Lond.* 164,” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 33: 13–16.
- — —. 1989. “Aristophanis Byzantii Aristotelis *Historiae Animalium Epitome*, 2.169–77,” in *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini*, vol. 1, ed. F. Adorno (Florence: Olschki), 338–45.
- Sharples, R. 1995. *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence. Commentary*, vol. 5: *Biology* (Leiden: Brill).
- Sider, D. 2002. “On On signs,” in *On the Opuscula of Theophrastus*, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh, G. Wöhrle (Stuttgart: Steiner), 99–111.
- Slater, W. J. 1982. “Aristophanes of Byzantium and Problem-Solving in the Museum,” *Classical Quarterly* 32: 336–49.
- Sorabji, R. 1993. *Animal Minds and Human Morals* (London: Duckworth).
- Staden, H. von. 1989. *Herophilus: The Art of Medicine in Early Alexandria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- — —. 1997. “Teleology and Mechanism: Aristotelian Biology and Early Hellenistic Medicine,” in *Aristotelische Biologie: Intentionen, Methoden, Ergebnisse*, ed. W. Kullmann, S. Föllinger (Stuttgart: Steiner), 183–208.
- De Stefani, E. L. 1904, “Per l’ ‘Epitome Aristotelis de Animalibus’ di Aristofane di Bizanzio,” *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 12: 421–45.
- Wehrli, F. 1969a. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 3: *Klearchos* (Basel/Stuttgart: Schwabe, 2d ed.).
- — —. 1969b. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 5: *Straton von Lampsakos* (Basel/Stuttgart: Schwabe, 2d. ed.).
- — —. 1969c. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 6: *Lykon und Ariston von Keos* (Basel/Stuttgart: Schwabe, 2d. ed.).
- — —. 1969d. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 7: *Eudemos von Rhodos* (Basel/Stuttgart: Schwabe, 2d ed.).

- — —. 1969e. *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, vol. 9: *Phainias von Eresos* (Basel/Stuttgart: Schwabe, 2d ed.).
- — —. 1983. "Der Peripatos bis zum Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit," in *Die Philosophie der Antike* 3, ed. H. Flashar (Basel: Schwabe), 459–599.
- White, S. 2002. "Eudemus the Naturalist," in *Eudemus of Rhodes* = *RUSCH* 11, ed. W. W. Fortenbaugh, I. Bodnar (New Brunswick: Transaction).
- Zeller, E. 1963. *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* 2.2⁵ (Hildesheim: Olms).



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Index of Ancient Sources for Chapters 2–9

AELIANUS, CLAUDIUS		APOLLONIUS PARADOXOGRAPHUS	
<i>De natura animalium</i>	314 n.35	<i>Historiae mirabiles</i>	
3.10	344 n.65, 345	27	345 n.71
6.1	311	APULEIUS	
7.47	340 n.54	<i>Apologia</i>	
11.37	334 n.34	36	308, 330, 331
<i>Varia historia</i>		ARCHEDEMUS	
3.33	257 n.65	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
AETIUS		2 SVF 3	206 n.70
<i>Placita philosophorum</i>		ARCHILOCHOS	
1.7.21	322	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
2.3.4	322 n.80	114 West	265 n.9
[ALEXANDER APHRODISIENSIS]		ARISTO ALEXANDRINUS	
<i>Problemata</i>		<i>Testimonia</i>	
1.74 (23.34–24.8 Ideler)	310 n.17	2 Mariotti	204
4.103 (22.11–15 Usener)	310 n.19	4	204
ANONYMUS		7	205 n.68
<i>Vita Pythagorae</i> (Photius, <i>Bibliotheca</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
249)		1 Mariotti	190 n.30
439b29	322	ARISTO CEUS	
ANTHOLOGIA GRAECA		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
<i>Appendix</i>		1 SFOD	182, 191
3.94 (305.16–18 Cougny		2A	182, 203
= 143(b) Page)	312–20	3	185, 206
3.101 (306.28–34 Cougny		4A	185
= 143(c) Page)	312–20	5	184, 208, 233 n.61
4.20 (393.19–29 Cougny		6	184, 208
= 143(a) Page)	312–20	8	180, 191, 197, 198,
ANTHOLOGIA PALATINA			207, 229 n.44
9.358	194	9	181, 185, 201
ANTIGONUS PARADOXOGRAPHUS		10–14	206 n.72, 296
<i>Historiarum mirabilium collectio</i>	314	10	209
27	339 n.51	11	209
60b	309 n.10	12	209
133	309 n.10	13A	209, 296
139	309 n.10	14A	206
154	309 n.10	16	186
172	309 n.10	17A	312–20

17B	312–20	31	182, 203
17C	316	41	301
17D	315 n.39, 316–19	42	302
18	180, 201	43	302
19–21	219 n.7	44	303
20	200 n.59, 227 n.31, 301	45	296
21	200 n.59, 301	ARISTO CHIUS	
21a–g	226 n.26, 262, 263	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
21a	220, 261 n.1, 262 n.2, 263	333 SVF 1	192 n.36, 229 n.46
21a.10	263	338	203
21a.26–30	262 n.2	341	208, 209
21a.29	262	342	209
21e.7–15	272	346	229 n.44
21e.10	275 n.29	348	200
21f.22–4	274	350	199, 210 n.77
21f.32	275 n.29	351	210
21g–o	219 n.7, 226 n.28,	358	211
	262, 262 n.4, 263, □272	371	209
21g.27–8	262	372	211
21g.29–h.17	273	375	207
21g.29–38	263	380	207
21g.31–2	275 n.30	381	207
21g.34	262, 263	382	206, 209
21g.35–j.2	272	383	210 n.77
21j.2–k.32	272	384	210 n.77
21j.3–17	273	386	210 n.77
21j.4	275 n.30	387	210 n.77
21k.3–l.37	262 n.4	392	210, 210 n.77
21k.32–l.4	272	394	210 n.77
21l.4–14	272	396	210 n.77
21l.14–38	272	397	210 n.77
21l.38–n.37	272	399	210 n.77
21m.20–2	275	400	296
21m.30–2	223	402	230 n.50
21m.36	275	ARISTO COUS	
21o.1–21	272	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
21o.17–21	262 n.4	1–2 Wehrli	205
21o.17	262	ARISTOPHANES	
21o.21–7	262	<i>Nubes</i>	
22	182, 206 n.72, 208, 296	449	276
23	181, 187, 188, 189, 190	1202	313 n.33
24A	181, 187, 190	ARISTOPHANES BYZANTIUS	
24B	187, 190	<i>Historiae animalium epitome</i>	
25	181, 187, 190	(CAG Suppl. 1)	314 n.35
26	208, 301	inscriptio (1.4–6	
27	208, 230 n.50	Lambros)	333 n.23, n.29
30	210	1.1–2.39	333 n.25

1.1	334, 334 n.32	2.481	355 n.96
1.2–22	335	2.488–91	351 n.87
1.2	334 n.32	2.581	351 n.87
1.11	334 n.32	ARISTOTELES	
1.15	334 n.32	<i>De anima</i>	310 n.19
1.17	334 n.32	2.3 414a29–415a13	336 n.38
1.23–6	335	<i>Physica</i>	
1.23	336 n.42	4.11 219b2	320 n.66
1.27–155	335	4.12 220b32	320 n.66
1.27	334 n.30, 335 n.35	4.14 223a21	320 n.66
1.31	336 n.42	<i>Historia animalium</i>	
1.33	336 n.42	1.1 488a28	340 n.55
1.42	336 n.42	1.5 490b3f.	338
1.98–113	351 n.87	1.6 490b27–30	344
2.1	335, 355 n.97, 336	2.1 498b5f.	338
2.2	336 n.40	2.1 500b23–4	338, 340
2.3	336 n.41, 337	2.17 507b15–17	338 n.49, 340 n.55
2.29	340	3.1 509b5–9	344
2.146	351 n.87	3.11 517b21–5	344
2.157	311	5.1 538b27–539a2	336 n.38
2.169–76	333 n.27	5.2 540a3–4	345
2.169–71	333	5.2 540a8–10	340 n.55
2.175	351 n.87	6.16 570a3–11	355 n.97
2.207–16	338f.	6.18 571b26–30	340 n.55, 341
2.207–8	347	6.29 578b23	331 n.9
2.207	348, 349	6.35 580a11–22	340 n.55, 341
2.208–9	349	6.35 580a11–13	339
2.208	340 n.54	6.35 580a13	339 n.50
2.209	340	6.37 581a1–2	344 n.66
2.210	349	8.1 588a16–18	336 n.38
2.211	349 n.86	8.2 592a23f.	355 n.97
2.212–13	350	8.5 594a25–7	338, 339
2.213	340	8.5 594a26–31	340 n.55
2.214	350	8.5 594a26–9	341
2.215	342, 351	8.5 594a29–31	339
2.216	340	8.6 606a21–7	340 n.55, 341 n.57
2.250	351 n.87	8.28 607a1–3	340 n.55
2.283	333	9.1 608a11	336 n.38
2.333	351 n.87	9.1 609b1–3	339, 340 n.55
2.347	351 n.87	9.1 609b10	331 n.9
2.380	331 n.9, 351 n.87	9.6 612b2	340 n.55
2.387	351 n.87, 355 n.96	9.6 612b4–10	345 n.67
2.424–7	343, 351	9.6 612b14	355 n.96
2.424	347 n.78, 351, 351 n.88	9.32 618b28–31	355 n.97
2.427	351 n.87, 352	9.36 620b5–8	339, 340 n.55, 342
2.457	351 n.87		

<i>De partibus animalium</i>		3.7 1233b38–1234a3	248 n.30,
1.1 639a15–b6	341		276 n.34
1.5 644a23–b7	341	7.1 1235a8–9	341 n.55
1.5 645a15–17	337	<i>Politica</i>	
3.14 674b7–15	355 n.96	8.4 1338b30–1	341 n.55
4.10 686a20–4	340 n.55	<i>Rhetorica</i>	
4.10 686a20–2	338, 340 n.54	1	265
4.10 686a22–3	342 n.60	1.2 1356a1–11	265 n.11
4.10 687b28–688a8	341 n.56	2	265
4.10 688a5–6	341 n.55	2.1 1377b20–1378a19	265 n.11
<i>De incessu animalium</i>		2.1 1378a8–18	266
14 712a24–8	349 n.83	2.1 1378a30–2	267
<i>De generatione animalium</i>		2.2–11	266
1.5 717b26–31	344	2.2 1378a30–1380a5	266
1.5 717b26–8	343	2.3 1380a6–b34	266
1.5 717b30–1	344	2.4 1380b35–1382a19	266
1.12 719b15–17	344	2.5 1382a20–1383a25	266
1.16 721a2–5	355 n.96	2.5 1383a25–b10	266
2.5 741a38f.	355 n.97	2.6 1383b11–1385a14	266
2.6 742a8f.	338	2.6 1385a14–5	266
2.6 742a8–10	341	2.7 1385a16–33	266
2.7 746a29–b11	341	2.7 1385a33–b10	266
3.4 771a21–2	338, 341	2.8 1385b11–1386b7	266
5.3 781b32–5	344 n.66	2.9 1386b8–15	266
<i>Ethica Nicomachea</i>		2.9 1386b16–1388a30	266
2.7	276	2.11 1388a31–b28	266
2.7 1107a33–1108b7	267	2.12–14	266
2.9 1109b23–6	267 n.15	2.15–17	266
3.6–4.8	267	2.16 1390b33	247 n.28
4	276 n.34	2.17 1391a33	247 n.28
4.3	274, 280 n.1	3.18 1419b6–9	276
4.3 1123b1–9	271 n.27	<i>Atheniensium Respublica</i>	
4.3 1124a19	275 n.30	50.3	247 n.29
4.3 1124b1–9	274 n.27	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
4.3 1124b4	274	253 Rose	341 n.55
4.3 1127b20–4	276	320 Rose = 211 Gigon	334 n.32
4.7–8	276	<i>Eudemus</i>	323 n.81
4.7	276, 280 n.1	[ARISTOTELES]	
4.7 1127a13–b33	248 n.30	<i>De spiritu</i>	307, 308 n.6
4.7 1127b31–2	276	<i>De coloribus</i>	308 n.6
<i>Ethica Eudemia</i>		<i>Physiognomonica</i>	
2.1 1220b5–6	271 n.23	3 807a31–b12	269
2.3 1220b21–1221b3	267 n.14	3 807b12–28	269
2.3 1221a6	248 n.30	3 807b28–808a1	269
2.3 1221a24–5	248 n.30	3 808a2–11	269
3	267 n.14	3 808a12	269

3 808a17	269	ASCLEPIUS TRALLIANUS	
3 808a19–27	269	<i>In Metaphysica</i> (CAG 6.2)	
3 808a27–9	248 n.32, 269	90.23–6 Hayduck	194
3 808a29–31	269	ATHENAEUS	
3 808a31–2	269	<i>Deipnosophistae</i>	
3 808a32–3	269	2 38F	209
3 808a33–b3	269	2 43F	315 n.39, 317
3 808b2–4	269	6 251C	209
3 808b4–6	269	7 281C–D	209
3 808b6–8	269	7 281C	208 n.73
3 808b8	270	7 306B	334 n.32
3 808b9–10	270	10 419C	209
6 811a17	341 n.55	10 434F–435A	310
6 811b33–35	248 n.32	13 563F	209
6 811b39–812a1	248 n.32	13 564A	209, 296
<i>Mirabilia</i>		15 674B	209
8 831a15–18	344 n.65	ATTICUS	
65 835a26	345	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
83 836b27–9	341 n.55	3.7–10 des Places	322 n.80
138	309 n.14		
138 844b16	332 n.15	BASILIIUS	
<i>Problemata</i>	307	Homiliae in Hexaemeron	
3.9	310	9.3 (151.2–5 de	
11.25	311	Mendieta–Rudberg)	344 n.65
12.2	310		
12.4	310	CALLIMACHUS	
12.9	310	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
15.6	310	177.23 Pfeiffer =	
31.25 959b37	310	259.23 SH	311 n.24
<i>Magna Moralia</i>		414–28	346 n.73
1.20–32	267 n.14	CENSORINIUS	
<i>De virtutibus et vitiis</i>		<i>De die natali</i>	
1	268	4.2–4	320 n.65
2–3	268	CHRYSIPIUS	
2 1250a3–4	268	vid. Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta	
4–7	268	CICERO	
4 1250a30–7	268	<i>Academica</i>	
5 1250b21	269	2.12	204
5 1250b42	269	2.123	200
7 1251b2–3	249 n.34	2.130	196, 200
7 1251b14–6	269	<i>Cato Maior de senectute</i>	
7 1251b24–5	269	1.3	180, 201
<i>Problemata inedita</i>		<i>De finibus</i>	
2.102 (310.24–31		2.35	196, 200
Bussemaker)	310 n.19	2.43	196, 200
		3.11	200, 200 n.61

3.12	200, 200 n.61	CONSTANTINUS PORPHYROGENITUS	
3.50	200 n.61	vid. Aristophanes Byzantius	
3.64	200 n.61	CRITOLAUS	
4.43	196, 200 n.61	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
4.47	200 n.61	11 Wehrli	321
4.49	200	12–13	320
4.60	200	14	320
4.68–9	200 n.61	15	320–2
4.78	200 n.61	16	322
5.7–8	201	17	322–3
5.9–12	201	18	323
5.13	181, 185, 199, 201, 233 n.61	19	323 n.82
5.14	321, 323	20	323 n.82
5.16–23	196 n.47		
5.23	196, 200	DICAEARCHUS	
<i>De legibus</i>		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
1.55	200	96 Mirhady	311
<i>De natura deorum</i>		DIODEGENES LAERTIUS	
1.37	200	<i>Vitae philosophorum</i>	
3.77	200	1.13–15	185
<i>De officiis</i>		1.16	199
1.6	196, 200	2.22	187, 190
1.99	197	2.64	193
1.126–9	197	2.83–5	193 n.37, 194
1.128	197	2.83–4	194
1.148	197	2.84	197 n.53
<i>Tusculanae Disputationes</i>		2.85	194
5.27	200	2.105	193
5.85	200	2.108	193
CLEARCHUS		2.110	195
<i>Fragmenta</i>		2.113–14	195
36 Wehrli	330 n.5	2.113	195
101–5	330	2.114	195
106–10	330	2.120	195, 195 n.41
CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS		4.33	257 n.66
<i>Stromata</i>		4.40–1	234
1.14.63.4	185	5.7	184
2.21.129.10	323 n.82	5.11	186
CODICES		5.30	323 n.82
<i>Appendix Vaticana I = Vaticanus</i>		5.32	322 n.80
<i>Graecus</i> 1144, ff 215v–225v		5.51	186
22	299	5.59	331
23	300	5.64	186
24	300	5.69	186
<i>Neapolitanus Graecus</i> II D 22 (ed. Sbordone)		5.70–4	184
		5.70	184
6–8	300	5.79	188

5.81	298	159.25	321 n.73
5.94	188	186.2 (= <i>Doxog. Gr.</i>	
6.80	195, 195 n.42, 195 n. 43	588.30)	321 n.73
6.85	195 n.41	<i>De fide</i> (GCS 3)	
6.103–5	196	9.35–39 (508.4–15 Holl	
7.2	196 n.49	and Dummer = <i>Doxog. Gr.</i>	
7.24	196 n.49	592.9–20)	320–2
7.34	195	[EPIPHANIUS]	
7.37	195	<i>Anacephalaeosis 1</i> (GCS 1)	
7.84	254 n.55	165.5 Holl (= Diels,	
7.104–10	196	<i>Doxog. Gr.</i> 587.2)	321 n.73
7.160–7	196	ERASISTRATUS	
7.160	195, 196, 209, 210,	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
	257 n.65, 257 n.66	75 Garofalo	345 n.69
7.161	209, 257 n.66, 295	ETYMOLOGICUM GENUINUM	
7.163	180, 191, 197, 197 n.53,	s.v. “Klitorion” (189.21	
	198, 199 n.57, 207, 217,	Miller)	317
	229 n.44, 255	ETYMOLOGICUM MAGNUM	
7.164	182, 187, 191, 204	s.v. “Klitorion” (519.51–3	
7.167	196	Gaisford)	318
7.168	294	EUDEMUS	
7.182	257 n.65	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
7.183–4	188	125–32 Wehrli	308 n.8
8.7	188	125	330 n.3
9.3–5	233	126–32	330
9.5	181, 187, 188, 189, 190		
9.11	181, 183, 190	GALENUS	
10.1	188	<i>De locis affectus</i> (vol. 8 Kühn)	
10.13–14	190	3.5 (150.5 Kühn)	246 n.27
10.14	181, 187, 190	<i>De venae sectione adversus</i>	
10.25	247 n.27	<i>Erasistratum</i> (vol. 11 Kühn)	
10.85	307 n.2	9 (183.14–85.5 Kühn)	345 n.69
		GEOPONICA	314 n.35
ELIAS		GNOMOLOGIUM VATICANUM	
<i>In Porphyrii Isagogen</i> (CAG 18.1)		120	299, 300, 301
21.7–10 Busse	298 n.9	121	299, 302
EPICURUS		122	299, 300, 301, 302
<i>Ad Pythoclem</i>		123	299
85	307 n.2	126	300
<i>Kuriai Doxai</i>		301	300
11	307 n.2	420	302–3
<i>Fragmenta</i>			
221 Usener	307 n.2	[HESYCHIUS]	
EPIPHANIUS		<i>Vita Aristotelis</i>	
<i>Panarion</i> (GCS 1)		9 Düring	185
157.6 Holl	321 n.73		

HIERONYMUS RHODIUS

Fragmenta

8A no.1a White	310 n.20
10	308 n.6, 309–10
11	321 n.70
30	310–11
40	308 n.6, 311
45	311–12, 332 n.20

HIPPIATRICA

Excerpta Lugdunensia (vol. 2

Oder–Hoppe)

9.16 (275.13)	336 n.54
---------------	----------

HOMERUS

Ilias

2.212–44	264
2.212	264
2.216–19	264, 264 n.8
2.220–1	264

NICANDER

Alexipharmaca

185	354 n.96
<i>Theriaca</i>	
36	354 n.96
101	354 n.96
139	354 n.96
171	354 n.96
195–9	354–5 n.96
422	354 n.96
579f.	354–5 n.96
586	354 n.96
635	354 n.96
669	354 n.96
689	354 n.96
740	354 n.96
741	354 n.96
816	354 n.96

IAMBlichUS

Fragmenta (ap. Stobaeus)

1.49.32 (366.25ff. Wachsmuth)	323 n.81
----------------------------------	----------

IOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS

Exlogae ex diversis Homilis (PG 63)

649	300 n.11
-----	----------

ISIDORUS

Etymologiae

13.13.2	318
13.13.3	316 n.42

LYCO

Fragmenta

1 SFOD	184
2	184, 185
3A	185
13	309, 331
15	308, 330 n.3, 332 n.17

MACROBIUS

In Somnium Scipionis

1.14.20	323
---------	-----

MICHAEL EPHESIUS

In Ethica Nicomachea (CAG 20)

483 Heylbut	302
-------------	-----

[OCCEL(L)US LUCANUS]

De universi natura

2.2 19 (15.17–23 Harder)	322
--------------------------	-----

ORIBASII

Collectiones medicae (CMG 6.1.1)

5.3.30 (120.13–14 Raeder)	319 n.60
5.3.35 (120.21–2)	318

OVIDIUS

Metamorphoses

15.322ff.	315 n.39, 318
-----------	---------------

PANAETIUS

Testimonia

73 Alesse	197
145	193
146	194, 198 n.54
147	194
150	194
151	192 n.36

PAPYRI

P.Lit.Lond.

164	333
-----	-----

P.Mil.Vogl.

8 309	355 n.96
-------	----------

P.Oxyrhynchus

221	355 n.97
-----	----------

PARADOXOGRAPHUS FLORENTINUS		col. 5.8–9	282 n.7
<i>Mirabilia de aquis</i>		col. 5.11–12	282 n.7
1–23 Giannini	317	col. 5.19–26	285 n.16
12	317	col. 6.27–34	281 n.5
24–6	312–20	col. 6.28–32	281 n.6
27	317 n.53	col. 6.30–2	281
PARADOXOGRAPHUS PALATINUS		col. 7.15–25	285 n.16
<i>Admiranda</i>		col. 8.3–4	283
5 Giannini	315 n.39, 317	col. 8.8–14	282 n.9
PARADOXOGRAPHUS VATICANUS		col. 8.11–12	283
<i>Admiranda</i>		col. 9	221
33 Giannini	316	col. 9.1–4	283
PHANIAS		col. 9.10–11	283
<i>Fragmenta</i>		col. 9.14–17	283 n.11
5 Wehrli	330	col. 9.14	221
36–50	330 n.6	col. 9.17–20	283 n.11
PHILO ALEXANDRINUS		col. 9.20–4	221 n.9
<i>De aeternitate mundi</i>		col. 9.24–5	283 n.11
6.55	320	col. 10	217–26
9.70	320	col. 10.8–10	221
PHILODEMUS		col. 10.10–30	220, 239–41,
<i>De adulatione</i> 1 (<i>PHerc.</i> 222)			280, 280 n.2
col. 10.2–3 Gargiulo	228 n.42	col. 10.10–15	285
col. 10.5–10	226, 227–8	col. 10.10–13	242, 245
<i>De adulatione</i> 2 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1457)		col. 10.10ff.	280, 281 n.4
col. 11.23 Bassi	242–3	col. 10.12–13	280, 280 n.2
fr. 23	228–9	col. 10.14–15	285 n.14
<i>Index Academicorum</i>		col. 10.16–9	256 n.64
N.14–15 Dorandi	182	col. 10.28–9	243, 244–6
N.29.4	182	col. 10.30–16.28	224, 225
O.25–9	182	col. 10.30	252
<i>Index Stoicorum</i>		col. 10.32–3	252 n.43
25 Dorandi	257 n.65	col. 11–16	231–2
<i>De morte</i> 4 (<i>PHerc.</i> 1050)		col. 11.4–5	252 n.43
col. 21.3–6 Kuyper	223	col. 11.11–13	257 n.68
<i>De stoicis</i>		col. 11.13	252 n.43
fr. 6, col. 15 Dorandi	197 n.53	col. 11.24–33	286
<i>De superbia</i> (<i>PHerc.</i> 1008)		col. 11.24–7	285
cf. Aristo Ceus, fr. 19–21		col. 11.26	252 n.43
fr. 1 Jensen	284 n.13	col. 12.4–9	286
col. 1.1–10.10	281 n.4	col. 12.4	252 n.43
col. 2.1–33	284	col. 12.12–16	257 n.67
col. 4.22–6	283	col. 12.12–13	252 n.43
col. 4.27–30	282 n.7	col. 12.12ff.	286
col. 5.1 ff.	285 n.15	col. 12.16–24	257 n.67
col. 5.5–6	284	col. 12.30–1	252 n.43

col. 13.8–30	286	col. 19.21–5	289
col. 13.8	252 n.43	col. 19.30	289
col. 13.25–30	286	col. 19.34–7	289
col. 13.30ff.	286	col. 20.3–32	253 n.46
col. 13.30	252 n.43	col. 20.32–21.37	253 n.47
col. 13.34–8	285	col. 21–3	219, 232
col. 14.2–3	252 n.43	col. 21.3–13	253 n.48, 288
col. 14.7–15	284	col. 21.13–37	253 n.49
col. 14.7–11	282 n.7	col. 21.20–2	281
col. 14.15–22	286 n.20	col. 21.22–33	288
col. 14.24–6	282 n.7	col. 21.22–7	281
col. 14.36–7	252 n.43	col. 21.35–7	257 n.68
col. 15.8–12	229–30, 243	col. 21.37–23.37	253 n.50
col. 15.12–22	286 n.19	col. 21.39	247
col. 15.12–13	252 n.43	col. 22.1–10	288
col. 15.22–6	248 n.33, 257 n.67	col. 24.1–21	253 n.51
col. 15.29–33	285	col. 24.1–10	288
col. 15.33–40	283	col. 24.7–8	291
col. 15.36–40	286 n.16	col. 24.9–10	291
col. 16.2–3	252 n.43	col. 24.21–7	225–6
col. 16.15–27	283, 286 n.19	col. 24.31–7	281
col. 16.15	252 n.43	PHOTIUS	
col. 16.27	252	<i>Bibliotheca</i>	
col. 16.29–24.21	225, 226	249 439b29	322
col. 16.29–17.17	252 n.44	PLATO	
col. 16.29–33	287	<i>Apology</i>	
col. 16.33–24.37	281	21D	275 n.31
col. 16.34–5	230	<i>Euthydemus</i>	
col. 16.34	280	300A	222
col. 17.1–6	289	<i>Gorgias</i>	
col. 17.7–18.11	253 n.45	491E	222
col. 17.7–17	289 n.26	<i>Hippias maior</i>	
col. 17.17–25	287	292D	313 n.33
col. 17.19–22	284	<i>Leges</i>	
col. 17.20–2	282 n.7	3 689B	302
col. 17.23–4	282 n.7	<i>Respublica</i>	
col. 17.25–18.11	289	1 337D	222
col. 18.3–10	282 n.7	7 527D	222, 223
col. 18.5–11	285	9 588C ff.	302
col. 18.11–19.2	253 n.46	[PLATO]	
col. 18.11ff.	282 n.7	<i>Definitiones</i>	268
col. 18.12–18	285, 288	PLINIUS SECUNDUS, GAIUS	
col. 18.35–8	288	<i>Naturalis historia</i>	
col. 18.35–7	285	7.12	317 n.51
col. 18.37–8	284	7.16	317 n.51
col. 19.9–17	289 n.27	7.27	317 n.51

8.133	344 n.65	PORPHYRIUS	
31.15	316–19	<i>Quaestiones Homericae</i>	
31.16	315 n.39, 317–19	1.274.11 Schrader	355 n.97
PLUTARCHUS		PROCLUS	
<i>Moralia</i>		<i>In Alcibiadem I</i>	
<i>Apophthegmata Laconica</i>		160.3 Creuzer	302
281A	207		
<i>De Iside et Osiride</i>		QUINTILIANUS	
365E	207	<i>Institutiones</i>	
<i>De virtute morali</i>		2.15.19	205
440F	207		
<i>De sera numinis vindicta</i>		RUFUS EPHESIUS	
553D–E	207	<i>Quaestiones medicinales</i>	
<i>De exilio</i>		(CMG suppl. 4)	
601E	209	12.63 (44.14–15 Gärtner)	318
605A–C	206	<i>Fragmenta</i> (ap. Oribasius,	
605B	185	<i>Collectiones medicae</i>)	
<i>Quaestiones convivales</i>		5.3.30 (120.13–14 Raeder)	319 n.60
612F	207		
623F	311 n.22	SEMONIDES	
626A–B	308 n.6, 309–10	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
<i>Amatorius</i>		7 West	265 n.8
766E	182	SENECA, LUCIUS ANNAEUS	
<i>Maxime cum principibus philosopho</i>		<i>Epistulae morales</i>	
<i>esse disserendum</i>		95.21	255 n.58
776C	206, 209, 255 n.60	95.39	255 n.58
<i>Praecepta gerendae reipublicae</i>		95.49	255 n.58
804C–E	230 n.50	95.65–6	251 n.42
804E	243	95.66	255 n.57
<i>De sollertia animalium</i>		SEXTUS EMPIRICUS	
965B–C	207	<i>Adversus Mathematicos</i>	
972A	344 n.65	2.61	205
<i>Non posse suaviter vivi secundum</i>		7.12	255 n.59
<i>Epicurum</i>		<i>Hypotyposes Pyrrhonianae</i>	
1096E	311	1.234	257 n.66
<i>Vitae</i>		SIMPLICIUS	
<i>Alexander</i>		<i>In Categorias</i> (CAG 8)	
4.4–6	311 n.22	159.23–160.2 Kalbfleisch	189–90
<i>Aristides</i>		SORANUS	
2.2–3	206	<i>Gynaecia</i>	
<i>Demosthenes</i>		4.6.1	246 n.27
10	199 n.57, 207	SOSICRATES RHODIUS	
30	199 n.57, 207	<i>Fragmenta</i>	
<i>Themistocles</i>		10 Andria	197 n.53
3.1–1	206	11	195 n.43

STEPHANUS BYZANTINUS		1.335	257 n.65
<i>Ethnica</i>		1.337	257 n.65
s.v. "Azania" (30.17–21		1.338	203
Meineke)	315 n.39, 317	1.339	257 n.65
s.v. "Tragasai" (630.1–4)	309 n.13	1.341	208, 209
STOBAEUS		1.342	209
<i>Anthologium</i>		1.343	257 n.66
1.1.29b Wachsmuth	322	1.344	257 n.66
1.8.40b	320	1.346	229 n.44
1.49.24	210	1.348	200
1.49.32	323 n.81	1.350	199, 210 n.77, 257 n.66
2.1.24	294	1.351	210, 257 n.66
2.2.14	210, 294	1.356	255 n.59
2.2.18	294	1.358	211
2.2.22	294, 295	1.371	209
2.2.23	294	1.372	211
2.7.3b	323 n.82	1.375	207
2.7.11m	248 n.37	1.380	207
2.7.14	323 n.82	1.381	207
2.31.83	295	1.382	206, 209, 255 n.60
2.31.95	295, 296 n.4	1.383	210 n.77
3.4.109 Hense	199, 257 n.66,	1.384	210 n.77
	295, 296, 301	1.386	210 n.77
3.4.110	295	1.387	210 n.77
3.5.42	296, 297 n.6	1.392	210, 210 n.77
3.7.29	97, 298 n.7	1.394	210 n.77
3.7.30	297	1.396	210 n.77
3.13.40	295	1.397	210 n.77
3.13.57	295, 296	1.399	210 n.77
3.16	301	1.400	296
3.16.7	301	1.402	230 n.50
3.20.69	295	2.604–5	323
3.29.70	297	2.809	323
3.29.90	297	2.879	323
4.1.144	297	2.937	323
4.15b.31	297	2.973	307
4.22a.16	295, 296	3.95	268 n.18
4.25.44	295	3.650	248 n.34
4.31c.91	297	STRABO	
4.31d.110	295, 296 n.4	<i>Geographica</i>	
4.50b.83	297	1.2.2	203
4.51.28	297, 298 n.7	1.2.3	203
4.52a.18	295	1.2.43	203
STOICORUM VETERUM FRAGMENTA		2.3.8	203
1.98	323	10.5.6	182, 203, 204 n.67, 298
1.333	192 n.36, 229 n.46,	14.1.35	203
	257 n.65, 66	14.2.19	182, 203

16.4.27	203	<i>De piscibus</i>	
17.1.5	182, 204, 205 n.68	12 (366.104–5 Sharples)	334 n.32
STRATO		<i>De signis</i>	
<i>Fragmenta</i>		30	344 n.65
92 Wehrli	331	<i>De vertigine</i>	
93	331	7–8	310 n.19
94–106	331 n.10	<i>Historia plantarum</i>	
94–9	331	1.4.3	334 n.32
		<i>Fragmenta</i>	
TELES		151 FHS&G	320 n.66
<i>Diatribae</i>		162	320 –2
15–16 Hense	298 n.7	185	320 n.65
29–31	298 n.7	210–21	312 n.26
TERTULLIANUS		210	312
<i>De anima</i>		269	323 n.81
5.1 (6.9–10 Waszink)	322 –3	417 no.22	311 n.22
THEMISTIUS		578	310
<i>Orationes</i>		715	311
21.255B	184	TRACTATUS COISLINIANUS	
THEODORETUS		12	275, 276 n.32
<i>Graecarum affectionum curatio</i>			
5.47	323 n.80	VITRUVIUS	
6.7	323 n.80	<i>De architectura</i>	
THEOPHRASTUS		8.3.21–3	312–20
<i>Characteres</i>		8.3.27	312
1	275		
10	301	XENOPHON	
24	274	<i>Hellenica</i>	
24.1	274	3.4.9	243 n.11
24.9	274		
<i>De causis plantarum</i>			
6.14.8	311		
6.17.1	310		